Conditions as to Time and Limitation under Different Statutes

"Time is precious and wasted time would never revisit. During the efflux of time, newer causes would sprout up necessitating newer persons to seek legal remedy by approaching the courts. So a lifespan must be fixed for each remedy. Unending period for launching the remedy may lead to unending uncertainty and consequential anarchy."

- ***Hon'ble Justice K.T.Thomas***
in N. Balakrishnan v. M. Krishnamurthy (1998 AIR SC 3222)

Introduction:

The law of limitation is a foundational principle in legal systems worldwide, prescribing fixed timeframes within which legal actions must be initiated. It ensures that disputes are resolved expeditiously, evidence remains reliable, and stale claims do not burden the judiciary. Every country has its laws regarding the timeframe within which suits, applications, and petitions must be filed. commonly referred to as "limitation periods."

The term "limitation," in its literal sense, refers to a constraint, rule, or set of circumstances that impose restrictions. The time frame for approaching a court or a tribunal is well recognized under civil, criminal, revenue, arbitration, and various other laws. It is based on the maxim that law helps those who are vigilant of their rights and not those who sleep over them.

The Core object of limitation concept:

The core object of the limitation concept is to ensure that disputes are resolved within a reasonable time frame, and to prevent parties from raising stale claim. The concept of limitation stipulates that any person who seeks to enforce his/her rights over another must institute an action within a prescribed period of time.

Principles of Limitation

1. **Prevention of Delay:** Limitation prevents delay in the resolution of disputes, ensuring that parties do not prolong litigation indefinitely.

2. Promoting Finality: Limitation promotes finality in litigation, ensuring that disputes are resolved within a reasonable time frame.

3. Protecting Rights: Limitation protects the rights of parties by ensuring that they are not prejudiced by delay.

4. Ensuring Justice: Limitation ensures that justice is served by preventing parties from raising stale claims.

The perspective behind barring a claim after the specified period of limitation is two-fold. The limitation period prevents errors in judgement, as with the passage of time and memory, the testimonies of witnesses in a case becomes weaker. Considering that the testimonies are essential for any court proceedings, inconsistencies and variability might result in errors in judgments.

Objectives of Limitation

1. To Prevent Stale Claims: Limitation prevents parties from raising stale claims, which may have been forgotten or lost over time.

2. To Promote Efficiency: Limitation promotes efficiency in the administration of justice, by ensuring that disputes are resolved quickly.

3. To Reduce Litigation: Limitation reduces litigation by preventing parties from raising frivolous or vexatious claims.

4. To Ensure Certainty: Limitation ensures certainty in the law, by providing clear time limits for the filing of suits, appeals, and applications.

The main object to limit any legal action is to give effect to the maxim ***'interest reipublicaeut sit finis litium'***, which means that in the interest of the State is required that there should be a limit to litigation and also to prevent any kind of disturbance or deprivation of what may have been acquired in equity and justice or by way of long enjoyment or what may have been lost by a party's own inaction, negligence or leaches (acquiescence). The intention in accepting the concept of limitation is that "*controversies are restricted to a fixed period of time, lest they should become immortal while men are mortal.*" This statutory restriction after a certain period

of time gives a status to enforce an existing right. Simply, it neither creates any right in favour of any person nor does it define or create any cause of action against the particular person but it prescribes about the remedy. These remedies can be exercised only up to a certain period of time and not subsequently.

The period of limitation also serves as an obligation for the criminal justice system to ensure the right of speedy justice, which forms a part of personal liberty. Principle of limitation needs appreciation in two parts. One part of the limitation concerns the parties' substantive claims if the claim made is permissible or time-barred. The other part of the limitation is more in the form of procedure. It involves the consideration of questions such as filing of an appeal or a petition within the prescribed timeframe failing which they have to move an application for condonation of the delay. Both these are essentially different in concept and should not be confused with each other, for example,

Under the Criminal law, section 468 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 [now Section 514 of BNSS] provides for various periods against cognizance of offences the quantum of punishment being the basis. For crimes punishable more than 3 years, there is no limitation period. It may be noted that limitation is applicable both in criminal and civil cases but the Limitation Act, 1963 is not applicable for criminal offences. Similarly, for Civil wrongs, the Limitation mandates different time limits whereunder the civil courts have to be approached from the date of cause of action.

It is not the out place to mention in new enactment Bharatiya Naragarik Sureakha Sanhita explanation is provided to the Section 514 of BNSS (Sec.468 Cr.P.C) regarding relevant date for computation of limitation period. Which reads as follows:

> Explanation.-For the purpose of computing the period of limitation, the relevant date shall be the date of filing complaint under section 223 (Sec.200 Cr.P.C) or the date of recording of information under section 173(Sec.154 Cr.P.C).

Halsbury's Laws of England outline the main objectives of the Law of Limitations as follows:

- Discouraging long-dormant claims, as they tend to be more cruel than just.
- Preventing defendants from losing evidence to dispute stale claims.
- Encouraging individuals with valid causes of action to pursue them diligently.
- Establishing two fundamental considerations underlying the Doctrine of Limitation and Prescription: firstly, rights that remain inactive for extended periods are deemed nonexistent, and secondly, rights related to property and those in general should not be subject to constant uncertainty, doubt, and suspense.

The Law of Limitation is not solely intended to nullify parties' rights but rather to encourage parties to seek remedies within a reasonable timeframe. It sets a lifespan for legal remedies to address injuries suffered by aggrieved individuals. If a suit or petition is filed after the specified limitation period, it will be considered barred and not allowed by the court. The primary purpose of these rules is to ensure that individuals act promptly to enforce their rights and to prevent old disputes from lingering indefinitely. As we know, in the process of law, various rights and liabilities have been evolved, statutorized, new rights are created and obligations are imposed. The limitation of actions is also concurrently addressed, and like other legal rights, the limitation for actions is scattered across various laws, each with different timeframes and emphases.

Every statute unequivocally contains limitation clauses that set definitive timelines for enforcing legal remedies. It is imperative that one must grasp these clauses fully to protect their rights and secure justice.

Law of Limitation is Procedural or substantive:

Statutes of limitations have two aspects: one relates to the extinguishment of the right if a claim or action is not initiated within a specified time, and the other merely bars the claim without affecting the underlying right. The right may either remain as a moral obligation or serve as the basis for a fresh enforceable obligation.

A statute that extinguishes the right affects substantive rights, while one that addresses the commencement of action without altering the right is considered procedural.

Incidentally one of the questions that is required to be resolved is whether the provisions of the limitation Act are purely procedural or they are also substantive legal principles. Such a question is not free from doubt or ambiguity. The distinction between substantive and procedural limitation was elucidated by Hon'ble Apex Court in a classic exposition, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Bharat Barrel and Drum Mfg. Company Private Limited v. The Employees State Insurance Corporation***- 1972 AIR SC 1935 has brought out the relevant principles as under:

> 4. The topic of procedure has been the subject of academic debate and scrutiny as well as of judicial decisions over a long period but in spite of it, it has defied the formulation of a logical test or definition which enables us, to determine and demarcate the bounds where procedural law ends and substantive law begins, or in other words it hardly facilitates us in distinguishing in a given case whether the subject of controversy concerns procedural law or substantive law. The reason for this appears to be obvious, because substantive law deals with right and is fundamental while procedure is concerned with legal process involving actions and remedies, which Salmond defines "as that branch of law which governs the process of litigation", or to put it in another way, substantive law is that which we enforce while procedure deals with rules by which we enforce it. We are tempted in this regard to cite a picturesque aphorism of Therman Arnold when he says *"Substantive law is canonised procedure. Procedure is unfrocked substantive law (HLJ 617 at p.645)".*
>
> 5. The necessity for enacting periods of limitation is to ensure that actions are commenced within a particular period, firstly to assure the availability of evidence documentary as well as oral to enable the defendant to contest the claim against him; secondly to give effect to the principle that law does not assist a person who is inactive and sleeps over his lights by allowing them when challenged or disputed to remain dormant, without asserting them in a court of law. The, principle which forms the basis of this rule is expressed in the maxim vigilantibus, non dormientibus, jura subveniunt (the laws give help to those who are watchful and not to those who sleep). Therefore the, object of the statutes of limitations is to compel a person to exercise his right to action within a reasonable time as also to discourage and suppress stale, fake or fraudulent claims. While this is so there are two

aspects of the statutes of limitation the one concerns the extinguishment of the right if a claim or action is not commenced with a particular time and the other merely bars the claim without affecting the right which either remains merely as a moral obligation or can be availed of to furnish the consideration for a fresh enforceable obligation. Where a statute prescribing the limitation extinguishes the right, it affects substantive rights while that which purely pertains to the commencement of action without touching the right is said to be procedural.

What is meant of Period of Limitation

The period of limitation defined in **Section 2(j)** is the **period of limitation** prescribed for a suit etc. and the Schedule appended to the said Act containing 137 Articles gives the description of the suits, period of limitation and the time from which the period begins to run for the purpose of limitation. It is an express definition given by the Act under section 2. The "**Prescribed period**" signifies the limitation period calculated by this Act.

The extent of application of limitation act:

The Act establishes specific periods of limitation for various types of suits, appeals, and applications. If a suit, appeal, or application is filed after the prescribed period, it is liable to be dismissed (Section 3). The scope and sphere of the definition is not limited to the period of limitation prescribed by the schedule of the Act, even the limitation Act applicable to other special and local Acts also unless and otherwise the special/local law does not expressly exclude its applicability of limitation Act.

Applicability of provisions of Limitation Act to proceedings under special Act

The provisions of the Limitation Act, 1963 apply only to proceeding in "Courts" and not to appeals or applications before bodies other than courts such as quasi-judicial Tribunals or executive authorities, notwithstanding the fact that such bodies or authorities may be vested with certain specified powers conferred on courts under the Code of Civil or Criminal Procedure. But even in such a situation the relevant special statute may contain an express provision conferring on the appellate authority the power to extend the prescribed period of limitation on

sufficient cause being shown by laying down that the provisions of Section 5 of the Limitation Act shall be applicable to such proceeding. [Sakuru v. Tanaji, A.I.R. 1985 S.C. 1279, Town Municipal Council, Athani v. Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Hubli, A.I.R. 1969 S.C. 1335: Nityananda M. Joshi v. Life Insurance Corporation of India, A.I.R. 1970 S.C. 209; and Sushila Devi v. Ramanandan Prasad, A.I.R. 1976 S.C. 177].

Section 29(2) of Act states that if any special or local law prescribes a different period of limitation, the provisions of the Limitation Act shall apply as if the special period were the one prescribed by the Schedule of the Limitation Act, but only to the extent that they are not expressly excluded by such special or local law.

When in case of conflict regarding period limitation is prescribed in any special or Local Law with Limitation Act

In cases where there is a conflict between the period of limitation prescribed in a Special or Local Law and the Limitation Act, 1963, Section 29(2) of the Limitation Act becomes relevant. According to Section 29(2), if any special or local law prescribes a different period of limitation for any suit, appeal, or application than what is provided in the Limitation Act, the provisions of the Limitation Act apply only to the extent that they are not expressly excluded by such special or local law.

Period of limitation which is different from that prescribed in any special or local law. The words "period of limitation" which are different from that prescribed in any special or local law do not mean that the Limitation Act should provide for a definite period which is different from that prescribed in the special or local law. This was the majority view in the case of ***Vidya Charan Shukla v. Khubchand Baghel,*** A.I.R. 1964 S.C. 1099. In the said case was considering the applicability of Section 12(2) of the Limitation Act to appeals under Section 116-A of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, which had provided a time-limit for filing an appeal, but the first Schedule to the Limitation Act had not provided any. Even the absence of a provision prescribing time-limit in the first Schedule to the Limitation Act was considered by the majority as prescribing a different period, because when

the First Schedule prescribes no time-limit for a particular appeal but the special law prescribes a time-limit for it, it prescribes a period different from that prescribed in the former. Thus, Section 29(2) of the Limitation Act would apply even to a case where a difference between the special law and Limitation Act arose by the omission to provide for a limitation to a particular proceeding under the Limitation Act.

Expressly exclusion test.

The words "expressly excluded" used in Section 29(2) do not mean that there must be an express reference made in the special or local law to the specific provisions of the Limitation Act of which the operation is to be excluded. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court laid down in the case of ***Hukumdev Narain Yadav v. Lalit Narain Mishra*** *A.I.R. 1974 S.C. 480* that even in a case where the special law does not exclude the provisions of Sections 4 to 24 of the Limitation Act by an express reference, it would nonetheless be open to the Court to examine whether and to what extent the nature of those provisions or the nature of the subject-matter and scheme of the special law exclude their operation. What the Court has to see is whether the scheme of the special law and the nature of the remedy provided therein are such that the Legislature intended it to be a complete Code. If on an examination of the relevant provisions it is clear that the provisions of the Limitation Act are necessarily excluded, then the benefits conferred therein cannot be called in aid to supplement the provisions of the Special Act.

The time limitation clause given under various statutes:

Different Acts and enactments specify various time frames for performing actions and submitting applications. I am giving a few of the time stipulations as follows:

1. Civil Procedure Code (CPC), 1908

For Filing Written Statement (Order VIII Rule 1) time prescribed is 30 days (max 90 days) from the date of summons service.

For filling of an Additional Written Statement (Order VIII Rule 9) time prescribed is 30 days.

The prescribed period for bringing the legal heirs on record is **90 days** from the date of death of the party involved (Article 120).

Few limitation periods in Execution Proceedings:

- For **delivery of possession** by Court to Auction Purchaser under Order 21 rule 95 CPC-**One year** from the date of confirmation of Sale
- For **enforcement of a decree granting mandatory Injunction** under Or 21 R 32r/w 35CPC - **3 years** from the date of decree or date fixed for performance. (Article 135 Limitation Act)
- For **execution of any decree other than maintenance decree**, mandatory and perpetual injunction - **12 years** from the date of decree Or Order becoming enforceable (Article 136 Limitation Act)
- To record **an adjustment or satisfaction of a decree** under Or 21 R 2 CPC **30 days** from the date of payment or adjustment. (Article 125 Limitation Act)
- For the **payment of the amount due under decree by installments** under Or 21 R 11(2) CPC - **30 days** from the date of decree.
- To **set aside sale in execution of decree including E.A. By JDr.** Or 21 R 89, 90 and Sec 47 CPC - **60 days** from the date of sale.

  Note : On 20-2-1990, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **P.K Unni v. Nirmala Industries** (1990) 2 SCC 378 held that the **limitation period for making deposit in an application for setting aside sale** under Order 21 Rule 89 is **30 days** from the date of sale as prescribed under Order 21 Rule 92(2).

However Code of Civil Procedure is amended in the year 2002 and in the said amendment Rule 92 in sub rule (2) for words "thirty days" is substituted with "**sixty days**".

- To **set aside sale in cases relating to debts due on Mortgage Deed - Any time before confirmation Of sale** as per Or 34 R 5 CPC.
- For **redelivery of possession** under Or 21 R 99 CPC **-30 days** from the date of dispossession (Article 128 Limitation Act)
- For **removal of resistance or obstruction to delivery 30 days from the date of resistance to delivery** under Or 21 R 97 CPC or obstruction. (Article 129 Limitation Act).

- For execution of decree granting **perpetual injunction-No time limit** prescribed.
- Time limit for **detention of an arrested JDr** in court Not **exceeding 15 days**. 1st proviso to premises under custody of officer of court. Or 21 R 40 CPC. Form No. 14 A.
- Time limit for **deposit of 1/4th sale proceeds Immediately after declaration of sale**. If DH is the purchaser may be dispensed with.
- Time limit for **deposit of the sale proceeds and 15 days from the date of sale** S.C. Charges (rule 94) or amount required for stamps Or 21 R 85 CPC.
- Time limit for **payment (deposit) of any batta in Within 2 days or period** if so fixed by execution except sale warrant batta. the judge. (Rule 144 C.R.P.)
- Time for payment of **sale proclamation batta within 2 days from the date of order**. along with S.P. Copies and Tom Tom charges.(Movables) Mandatory provision. Rule 187 CRP.
- Time for payment of **sale warrant batta. A week before date fixed for sale**. Mandatory provision Rule 187 CRP. Return of decree of other courts entered in CR 15 **Within 3 days after expiry of 1 year**.
- If **execution is not levied** in execution court. **Time from the date of receipt of other court decree.** (Date of transmission is not the criteria. Rule 138 CRP)
- **Time for sale** (Or 21 R 68 CPC) For **immovables after expiry of 15 days** from the date on which the copy of proclamation is affixed on the court notice board. **For movables it is 7 days.**

2. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhitha (BNSS)

- Section 514 (Sec. 468 Cr.P.C) bars cognizance of offences after:

- 6 months for offences punishable with fine only.
- 1 year for offences punishable with up to 1-year imprisonment.
- 3 years for offences punishable with up to 3-year imprisonment.
- No limitation for offences punishable with more than 3 years.

3. Specific Relief Act

The limitation period for filing a suit under Section 6 of the Specific Relief Act is **six months from the date of dispossession**.

The limitation period for filing a suit for specific performance under the Specific Relief Act, 1963, is governed by Article 54 of the Limitation Act, 1963, which is three years from the date fixed for performance, or if no date is fixed, from the date the plaintiff had notice of the refusal to perform.

4. Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996

The Limitation Act applies to arbitrations similarly to court proceedings as per the Section 43 of the Act.

Under Section 34(3) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, an application to set aside an arbitral award must be filed within three months from the date of receipt of the award

Time limit for filing an appeal under Section 37 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is generally 120 days, inclusive of a 30-day grace period, mirroring the limitation period for challenging an arbitral award under Section 3

5. Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881

- Time limit for issuing notice u/Section 138 (Dishonour of Cheque): Complaints after the receipt of information from the bank regarding the return of the cheque as unpaid, he must makes a demand for the payment of the said amount of money by giving a notice; in writing, to the drawer of the cheque, within 30 days.

For filing compliant under Act as per Section 142 is one month from the date of the cause of action arises under clause (c) of the proviso to section 138

6. Consumer Protection Act, 2019

Section 69(1): Complaints must be filed within 2 years from the date of the cause of action.

7. Hindu Marriage Act, 1955

Section 12 (Annulment of Marriage): Petition must be filed within 1 year of discovering fraud/force.

8. Land Acquisition Act, 1894

Section 5A (Objections): Must be filed within 30 days of notification.

9. Special Marriage Act, 1954

Section 25 (Annulment of Marriage): Petition must be filed within 1 year from the date of after the coercion had ceased or, as the case may be, the fraud had been discovered

10. Indian Trusts Act, 1882

- Section 10 (Breach of Trust): Suit must be filed within 3 years from the breach.

11. Motor Vehicle Act.1988

- Section 166(3) Claims for compensation must be made within six months from the date of accident.

12. Domestic violence Act, 2005

Section 29- Appeal has to prefer to the Court of Session within **thirty days** from the date on which the order made by the Magistrate is served on the aggrieved person or the respondent, as the case may be, whichever is later.

13. Factories Act, 1948

Section 106 – For taking cognizance of offence inspector has to make a complaint within three months from the date he becoming aware of the alleged offense, or six months if it involves disobeying a written order.

Judicial Interpretations on Limitation

- What should be the approach of courts while considering applications under section 5 of Limitation Act, 1963, has been indicated by the Hon'ble Supreme court in ***Shakuntala Devi Jain v. Kuntal Kumari*** - AIR 1969 SC 575], this Court reiterated the following classic statement from Krishna vs. Chathappan [1890 ILR 13 Mad 269] :

> "... Section 5 gives the courts a discretion which in respect of jurisdiction is to be exercised in the way in which judicial power and discretion ought to be exercised upon principles which are well understood; the words `sufficient cause' receiving a liberal construction so as to advance substantial justice when no negligence nor inaction nor want of bona fides is imputable to the appellant."

- Justice should not be denied merely due to technical lapses. Courts may condone delay if sufficient cause is shown In ***N.Balakrishnan v. M. Krishnamurthy*** the Hon'ble supreme court held:

> "It is axiomatic that condonation of delay is a matter of discretion of the court. Section 5 of the Limitation Act does not say that such discretion can be exercised only if the delay is within a certain limit. Length of delay is no matter, acceptability of the explanation is the only criterion. Sometimes delay of the shortest range may be uncondonable due to a want of acceptable explanation whereas in certain other cases, delay of a very long range can be condoned as the explanation thereof is satisfactory. Once the court accepts the explanation as sufficient, it is the result of positive exercise of discretion and normally the superior court should not disturb such finding, much less in revisional jurisdiction, unless the exercise of discretion was on wholly untenable grounds or arbitrary or perverse. But it is a different matter when the first court refuses to condone the delay. In such cases, the superior court would be free to consider the cause shown for the delay afresh and it is open

to such superior court to come to its own finding even untrammeled by the conclusion of the lower court.

10. . . . The primary function of a court is to adjudicate the dispute between the parties and to advance substantial justice.....

11. Rules of limitation are not meant to destroy the rights of parties. They are meant to see that parties do not resort to dilatory tactics, but seek their remedy promptly. . . .

12. A court knows that refusal to condone delay would result in foreclosing a suitor from putting forth his cause. There is no presumption that delay in approaching the court is always deliberate. This Court has held that the words "sufficient cause" under Section 5 of the Limitation Act should receive a liberal construction so as to advance substantial justice. . . .

✹ The objective of the law of limitation is to prevent the outdated, fictitious, or fraudulent claims while also requiring a person to exercise his rights to action within the prescribed time. It is a settled principle that law does not help those who sleep over their rights. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Bharat Barrel and Drum Mfg. Co. Ltd. v. ESI Corpn.,*** (1971) 2 SCC 860 has Emphasizes that limitation laws balance the rights of claimants and defendants and observed as under-

"The law of limitation appertains to remedies because the rule is that claims in respect of rights cannot be entertained if not commenced within the time prescribed by the statute in respect of that right. Apart from Legislative action prescribing the time, there is no period of limitation recognised under the general law and therefore any time fixed by the statute is necessarily to be arbitrary. A statute prescribing limitation however does not confer a right of action nor speaking generally does not confer on a person a right to relief which has been barred by efflux of time prescribed by the law. The necessity for enacting periods of limitation is to ensure that actions are commenced within a particular period, firstly to assure the availability of evidence documentary as well as oral to enable the defendant to contest the claim against him; secondly to give effect to the principle that law does not assist a person who is inactive and sleeps over his rights by allowing them when challenged or disputed to remain dormant without asseting them in a court of law. The principle which forms the basis of this rule is expressed in the maximum vigilantibus, non dermientibus, jura subveniunt (the laws give help to those who are watchful and not to those who sleep). Therefore the object of the statutes of limitations is to compel a person to exercise his right of action within a reasonable time as also to discourage and suppress stale, fake or fraudulent claims While this is so there are two aspects of the statutes of limitation the one concerns the extinguishment of the right if a claim or action is not commenced with a particular time and the other merely bare the claim

without affecting the right which either remains merely as a moral obligation or can be availed of to furnish the consideration for a fresh enforceable obligation."

- Limitation Act Applicable To Suits, Appeals, Application Filed In Courts, Not Before Statutory Authorities as held by Hon'ble Apex court in case of ***Ganesan Rep. by its Power Agent G. Rukmani Ganesan v. Commissioner, The Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Board*** - (2019) 7 SCC 108.

- The Hon'ble Apex court in the case of ***Sesh Nath Singh Vs. Baidyabati Sheoraphuli Co-operative Bank Ltd*** - 2021 INSC 199 noted that Section 5 does not speak of any application and it enables the Court to admit an application or appeal if the applicant or the appellant, as the case may be, satisfies the Court that he had sufficient cause for not making the application and/or preferring the appeal, within the time prescribed and held that;

> " Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 does not speak of any application. The Section enables the Court to admit an application or appeal if the applicant or the appellant, as the case may be, satisfies the Court that he had sufficient cause for not making the application and/or preferring the appeal, within the time prescribed. Although, it is the general practice to make a formal application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, in order to enable the Court or Tribunal to weigh the sufficiency of the cause for the inability of the appellant/applicant to approach the Court/Tribunal within the time prescribed by limitation, there is no bar to exercise by the Court/Tribunal of its discretion to condone delay, in the absence of a formal application."

Conclusion

The law of limitation transcends mere procedural mechanics; it acts as a critical safeguard for justice. It demands that legal disputes to be resolved within reasonable timeframes, safeguarding both claimants and defendants from the uncertainties associated with prolonged litigation.

Though limitation periods differ across statutes, the overarching principle remains: **Justice delayed is justice denied**. Courts must navigate the fine line between strict adherence to limitation rules and equitable considerations, ensuring that genuine claims are not dismissed due to technicalities.

Thus, legal practitioners and litigants must remain vigilant, actively enforcing their rights within the prescribed time limits to avoid irrevocable loss of remedies.

---------- oOo ----------

- **Grandhi Subrahmanyam**
XI Addl. District & Sessions Judge
Gudivada