

GAHC010058442026



undefined

**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT**  
**(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**

**Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/1295/2026**

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK AND ANR.  
REPRESENTED BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR AND CEO, PUNJAB  
NATIONAL BANK, HEAD OFFICE, PLOT NO 4, SECTOR 10, DWARKA, NEW  
DELHI-110075

2: THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK  
HEAD OFFICE  
PLOT NO.4  
SECTOR 10  
DWARKA  
NEW DELHI-11007

VERSUS

DEBASHISH ROY  
S/O LATE NALINI MOHAN ROY, R/O HOUSE NO 3, SUB LANE NO. 4, BYE  
LANE NO. 7, LACHITNAGAR, GUWAHATI-781007

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : MR. S DUTTA,

**Advocate for the Respondent** : MR. DEBASHISH ROY, RESPONDENT IN PERSON,

Linked Case : CRP/0/0

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK AND ANR  
REPRESENTED BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR AND CEO PUNJAB  
NATIONAL BANK

HEAD OFFICE  
LOT NO 4  
SECTOR 10 DWARKA  
NEW DELHI 110075

VERSUS

DEBASHISH ROY  
S/O LAE NALINI MOHAN ROY  
R/O HOUSE NO 3 SUB LANE NO 4 BY LANE NO 7  
LACHITNAGAR  
GUWAHATI 781007

-----  
Advocate for : Sidhant Dutta  
Advocate for : appearing for DEBASHISH ROY

**BEFORE**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MICHAEL ZOTHANKHUMA**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH MAZUMDAR**

**ORDER**

**Date : 24.07.2026**  
*(R. Mazumdar, J)*

Heard Mr. S. Dutta, learned Sr. Counsel appearing with the assistance of Ms. K. Bora for the applicants. Also heard Mr. D. Roy, the respondent in person.

2. This is an application paying for condonation of 68 days delay in filing the connected writ appeal against the Judgement and Order dated 19/11/2025, passed in WP(C) No.4958/2024.

3. By referring to the contents of the interlocutory application, the learned Senior Counsel for the applicants has submitted that appropriate action had been taken for having the appeal preferred on time. However, due to inter-office

communication, a minimal delay has been caused. The learned Sr. Counsel has also submitted that the connected writ appeal requires a hearing on merit.

4. The respondent in person has submitted that the applicants have failed to explain with reasons sufficient cause for delay of the 68 days. He has further submitted that the limitation law exists to prevent stale claims and that the instant interlocutory application does not require any further consideration of this Court.

5. Having gone through the reasons given in paragraph 5 of the interlocutory application and having considered the submissions made on behalf of the parties, we deem it appropriate to condone the delay of 68 days in filing the interlocutory application, subject to the payment of cost of Rs.5,000/- to the respondent herein within a period of 3(three) weeks from today.

6. On proof of payment being produced before the Registry, the Registry shall number the writ appeal and list it for admission.

7. The I.A. is accordingly disposed of.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**