



2026:DHC:8285



\$~82

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% ***Date of Decision: September 23rd, 2026***

CNR No. DLHC010455772026

+ **W.P.(C) 14033/2026**

S C GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person

versus

DIRECTOR GENERAL ALL INDIA RADIO.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (Oral)

1. By the present petition, the petitioner seeks a direction to the respondent to pay damages to the extent of ₹30 crore on account of defamation, mental harassment, agony, physical, monetary and social harassment suffered by the petitioner that was allegedly occasioned as a consequence of the false information tendered by the respondent to DGS&D in the year 1989.

2. The petitioner's case, as discernible from the pleadings is that DGS&D awarded a contract in favour of the petitioner in respect of supply of certain microphones on 04.11.1988. According to the petitioner disputes thereafter arose in relation to excise duty, price preference and inspection of microphones.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the goods supplied by him were duly inspected despite which an incorrect communication was



2026:DHC:8285



furnished by the respondent to DGS&D on 26.07.1989 stating that the microphones D-222-897 pieces had not been inspected.

4. The petitioner has further referred to certain correspondences exchanged in August – November 1989 and claims interest and other monetary amounts allegedly arising from delay in inspection and release of inspection notes occasioned by the respondent.

5. On account of the aforesaid, the petitioner has preferred the present petition.

6. Before this Court may be persuaded to delve into an analysis of the issues at hand, the extraordinary length of interval between the alleged cause of action and institution of the present proceedings is at once apparent.

7. The thrust of the petitioner's case pertains to the principal events that occurred somewhere between 1988 and 1989. Further, even the communication that is alleged to constitute the very bedrock of the claim dates way back to 26.07.1989. The discrepancy in the inspection and subsequent release of inspection note also dates back to August to November 1989. What is thus sought to be adjudicated by this Court in the present proceedings is thus a dispute that originated approximately thirty seven years ago.

8. The petitioner has failed to furnished any satisfactory explanation as to why a claim founded upon events occurring in the years 1988-89 ought to be entertained by the Court in exercise of power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in the year 2026.

9. While there is no period of limitation for Courts to exercise powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, it has



2026:DHC:8285



consistently been emphasised that the extraordinary jurisdiction of Courts ought not to be ordinarily exercised in respect of stale claims where the litigant has failed to approach the Court expeditiously [Ref. ***P.S. Sadasivaswamy v. State of T.N. : (1975) 1 SCC 152***].

10. Furthermore, the controversy pointed out by the petitioner in the present case appears to be a contractual dispute arising out of the procurement and supply of microphones and would demand determination of questions such as what material was actually supplied, whether the supplied materials were inspected; whether the supplied materials corresponded with the contractual specifications or not, whether particular consignments were received or not, and the consequences of the alleged communications involving disputed questions of facts.

11. The said questions cannot anyway be delved into in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution especially after a lapse of time of more than three decades.

12. The present petition, being devoid of merit, is accordingly dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 23, 2026

“SS”