

1

RP-275-2024

## IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR

**BEFORE** 

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA, CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF ON THE 28<sup>th</sup> OF AUGUST, 2025

**REVIEW PETITION No. 275 of 2024** 

SMT. POONIYA RAIDAS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

**Appearance:** 

Shri G.S.Uddey - Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Janhavi Pandit - Additional Advocate General for respondents/State.

## **ORDER**

Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice

- 1. Petitioner seeks review of the order dated 06.04.2011.
- 2. Petitioner was compulsorily retired on 17.05.2001, thereafter a writ petition was filed challenging the order of retirement in the year 2010 said writ petition was dismissed by learned Single Judge holding that there was unexplained delay in approaching the writ court. Petitioner assailed the order of the writ court before the Division Bench in the subject writ appeal No.358/2011 said writ appeal was dismissed on 06.04.2011 noticing that the petitioner was compulsorily retired by order dated 17.05.2001 and the first representation was filed on 05.07.2009 after a delay of more than 08 years and no steps were taken to challenge the order of compulsory retirement.

2 RP-275-2024

- 3. The stand taken by petitioner that she was unwell was not borne out from the medical record produced before the appellate Court consequently, the appellate court had upheld the order of learned Single Judge in dismissing the writ petition on the ground of delay.
- 4. Subject review petition has been filed seeking review of order dated 06.04.2011 on 07.03.2024 i.e. after a delay of nearly 13 years. In the condonation delay application, it is contended that the delay occurred on account of the fact that son of the petitioner was unwell and she was taking care of him.
- 5. We are not satisfied that petitioner has sufficiently explained the delay in approaching this Court. In the first instance there was a delay of 09 years in approaching the writ court and now a delay of 13 years in filing the review petition.
- 6. In view of the above, we find no ground to condone the delay or any merit in the review petition, the same is accordingly dismissed.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA) CHIEF JUSTICE (VINAY SARAF) JUDGE

**VPA**