

GAHC010013012017



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

Case No. : WP(C)/909/2017

PRANJAL BEZBORH
S/O LT. GOKUL BEZBORAH R/O SEUJI PATH, TEKELA, SIRING GAON,
DIBRUGARH, DIST. DIBRUGARH, ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE DIBRUGARH UNIVERSITY and 4 ORS.
ASSAM REP. BY ITS REGISTRAR, DIBRUGARH UNIVERSITY.

2:Registrar
Dibrugarh University
Dibrugarh
Assam
PIN- 786004

3:Gender Sensitisation and Complaint Committe for Sexual Harassment (GSCCSH)
Dibrugarh University

Dibrugarh
Assam
PIN- 786004
Represented by its Chairperson.

4:Chief Enquiry Officer

Gender Sensitisation and Complaint Committee for Sexual Harassment (GSCCSH)
Dibrugarh University
Dibrugarh
Assam
PIN- 786004

5:Brishni Borkotoky

Assistant professor
Centre for Management Studies
Dibrugarh University
Dibrugarh
Assam

PIN- 78600

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR.A BHATTACHARYA, MR.T J MAHANTA,MS.M KALITA,MR.P P DUTTA

Advocate for the Respondent : MR.N C DAS, MS K BORAH (R-5),MR. S DUTTA (R-5),MR S DUTTA (R-5),MR SISHIR DUTTA (R-5),SC, DIB. UNIVERSITY

**BEFORE
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDL.) MR. CHINMOY BARUAH**

ORDER

Date : 09.09.2025

Case taken up before the Lawazima Court.

Learned counsel Mr. A. Barua appears on behalf of Mr. T.J. Mahanta, learned counsel for the petitioner. Heard.

Perused the records.

Perusal of the recent office note dated 09.09.2025 reveals that notice was issued to the respondent No. 5 by registered post with A/D on 18.08.2025.

Now, in respect of the aforesaid notice issued to the respondent No. 5, it appears that the A/D card has been received bearing the full signature (*in vernacular language*) of a person, namely, "**Ranjit Patar**". It is however not known as to how the recipient is related to the respondent No. 5.

In this context, the Hon'ble Privy Council in the case of **Harihar Banerji v. Ramsashi Roy, 1918 SCC OnLine PC 58** held that *where a notice was sent by registered post properly addressed there is a strong presumption that the notice was properly delivered in the usual course and this is not rebutted by the fact that the acknowledgment is signed by a person other than the addressee*. In the present case, it appears from the A/D card that the registered notice was properly addressed to the respondent No.5. Thus, **in the present**

case, even though the A/D card was signed by a person other than the addressee, the notice will be presumed to be served on the said respondent (respondent No. 5).

In view of the above, the matter may be placed before the Hon'ble Court.

Joint Registrar (Judicial)

Comparing Assistant