



2026:AHC-LKO:22107-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - A No. - 3261 of 2026

U.O.I. Thru. Secy. Ministry Of Defence New Delhi
And 3 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

No. Jc 341913p Ex Sub Mohan Chandra

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Balbir Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE MANJIVE SHUKLA, J.**

1. This case has been listed in the list of fresh cases for the second time. None has appeared on behalf of the petitioners.
2. The Union of India has filed this petition challenging a judgment and order dated 23.10.2024 passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Lucknow in Original Application No. 1021 of 2023.
3. Though, provisions of Limitation Act, 1963 do not apply to writ proceedings, nevertheless, a litigant has to invoke the discretionary extraordinary jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with promptness and diligence without any laches. In the case at hand, this petition has been filed after almost a year and a half of the judgment having been passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal.
4. The delay in filing this petition has been explained in Paragraph No's. 4 and 5 of the writ petition which reads as under:-

"4. That as far as some delay which, has occurred in filing the writ petition, the same is not deliberate but the same is bona fide and genuine which deserves to be condoned. It is stated that the judgment was delivered by the Armed Force Tribunal on 13.12.2022. Thereafter, the matter was examined at the level of petitioner No.1 and it was informed that all cases of related to grant of disability pension/element other than invalidation/deemed

invalidation cases were under consideration with the learned Attorney General of India regarding whether such orders are to be implemented or need to be challenged. After due deliberation, the Learned Attorney General on 18.09.2023 has opined to challenge all such orders where individuals were discharged from service on completion of terms of engagement on account of disability, "neither attributable to nor aggravated" (NANA) superannuation cases by filing writ petitions in Hon'ble High Courts of competent jurisdiction. Thereafter the Petitioner no.1 vide the letter dated 04.10.2023 had recommended that all such orders be challenged by way of filing writ petitions in the Hon'ble High Courts of competent jurisdiction. Subsequently, vide the letter dated 13.03.2025 issued by petitioner no. 3 a direction was issued to all the concerned Legal Cells to file writ petitions before the competent High Courts.

5. That thereafter, the papers were routed through the concerned offices and the petitioners approached the learned Deputy Solicitor General for preparation of the present writ petition. It is submitted that some time was consumed in collecting the requisite records, briefing the counsel, drafting and finalisation of the writ petition. It is further submitted that owing to the large volume of similar cases arising out of orders passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal, additional time was unavoidably consumed in processing and filing the instant writ petition. That the delay so occasioned is neither deliberate nor intentional but is bona fide and procedural in nature. In view of the facts and circumstances stated hereinabove, it is most humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to condone the delay in filing the present writ petition in the interest of justice."

5. Apart from the aforesaid, nothing else has been stated about the delay.

6. We have carefully gone through each word of Paragraph No's. 4 and 5 and do not find any bona fide or genuiness or diligence in filing of the writ petition challenging a judgment which was delivered in October, 2024. Apparently, the writ petition suffers from delay and laches which are

grounds on which, the writ court can decline to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Vague and general recitals have been made in the above quoted paragraphs, without giving any dates and details. This is nothing but a sham attempt to cover up such delay and laches on the part of the petitioner. We do not see any reason to entertain this writ petition after more than a year. It would be highly unreasonable to make the respondent herein suffer these proceedings by issuance of notice to him after such delay and laches on the part of the petitioner.

7. In fact, we find that verbatim similar explanation is being offered in several writ petitions wherein such delay is involved, which itself goes to show that such petitions are being filed mechanically and the explanation offered for delay is also mechanical. We may in this very context refer to other writ petitions which are listed today bearing Writ A No. 3241 of 2026 and Writ A No. 3237 of 2026. On a comparison of Paragraph No's. 4 & 5 of this writ petition with Paragraph No's. 4 & 5 of Writ A No. 3241 of 2026 and Writ A No. 3237 of 2026, we find that the recitals are almost verbatim similar. This explains a highly casual approach on the part of the petitioner.

8. The writ petition is **dismissed** in the aforesaid terms.

March 30, 2026

Lokesh Kumar

(Manjive Shukla,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)