

GAHC010041002026



undefined

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

**Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/676/2026**

THE UNION OF INDIA  
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF  
INDIA MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS NORTH BLOCK NEW DELHI 110001.

2: THE DIRECTOR GENERAL  
ASSAM RIFLES HEAD QUARTER MAHANIDESHALAYA ASSAM RIFLES  
SHILLONG MEGHALAYA -PIN 973011.

3: THE BRIGADIER (PERS)  
HEAD QUARTER MAHANIDESHALAYA ASSAM RIFLES  
SHILLONG MEGHALAYA-11.

4: THE COMMANDANT  
35TH ASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO PIN-932035.5. THE COMMANDANT 39TH  
ASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO  
PIN -932039

VERSUS

NO 33900745 RFN BB RAJIB SINGH  
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS/O RAM LAL PRESENTLY SERVING AT  
39TH ASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO.

2:NO 3900748 RFN WM NAZAKET HUSSAIN  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS/O JAVED AHMED PRESENTLY SERVING AT  
39TH ASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO

3:NO 3900770 RFN BB VISHWANATH YADAV  
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS/O RAMNARAYAN YADAV PRESENTLY SERVING  
AT 39TH ASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO.

4:NO 3900773 RFN WM DHEER SINGH  
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS/O MAHENDRA SINGH PRESENTLY SERVING AT  
39TH ASSAM RIFLES C O 99 APO

5:NO 3900722 RFN WM JINDAS J  
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARSS/O NAJANADAS JPRESENTLY SERVING AT  
39THASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO.

6:NO 3900692 RFN BB NAWLIAM WANGSU  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARSS/O LAMPANG WANGSUPRESENTLY SERVING AT  
39THASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO.

7:NO 5020491 RFN SAFAI SATYA RAM CHOUDHARY  
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARSS/O LATE KALPNATHPRESENTLY SERVING AT  
39THASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO.

8:NO 3501011 RFN WM JUGAL KUMAR  
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARSS/O SH NANAK CHANDPRESENTLY SERVING AT  
35THASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO.

9:NO 2601869Y RFNSAFAI NARAYANAN S  
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARSS/O SWAMINATHAN PRESENTLY SERVING AT  
26THASSAM RIFLES C/O 56 APO.

10:NO 2601188W RFN EBR NARESH RAM  
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARSS/O LATE BRIJ RAMPRESENTLY SERVING AT  
26THASSAM RIFLES C/O 56 APO.

11:NO 3501021N RFN COOK KISHORE RAM  
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARSS/O SRI GOVIND RAMPRESENTLY SERVING AT  
35THASSAM RIFLES C/O 99 APO

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : MS. B SARMA,

**Advocate for the Respondent** : MR V KUMAR,

**BEFORE**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NELSON SAILO**

**O R D E R**

**31.03.2026**

Heard Ms. B. Sharma, learned CGC, appearing for the applicants, who submits that the connected writ petition being WP(C) No.4423/2024 was disposed of by this Court vide common order dated 01.04.2025 with a direction that the respondent authorities should complete the process of

cadre review as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of the order. Learned CGC submits that despite the endeavour made by the respondents/applicants to complete the process within the time frame, they are unable to do so and it is for this reason that the instant application has been filed. In this connection, she refers to paragraph No.5 of the application, which is reproduced herein as under:-

*“5. That the applicants state that the authorities are doing their best to comply/implement the common order dated 1/4/25. However, as there is a large nos. of petitioners, the authorities have to verify the details of each of the petitioners. More so prior to compliance/implementation the approval from the Ministry is also required. The process for compliance/implementation of the common order dated 1/4/25 is under process. However the authorities requires further six (6) months time to complete the process. As such, the applicants file this instant application for extension of six months time to comply/implement the common order dated 1/4/25.”*

**2.** Mr. V. Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents/ writ petitioners submits that sufficient time has been granted to them and in fact the six months period given was expired on 01.10.2025. He therefore, submits that if time is to be granted, same should be not more than two months.

**3.** I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the rival parties and also the materials available on record.

**4.** Ideally the applicants should have sought for extension of time before the expiry of the six months period granted to them instead of filing the application much later thereafter. It is however, seen that from the statements made in paragraph 5 of the application, as abstracted herein above, the entire exercise requires approval of the Ministry concerned and that the same also demonstrates that the case of the writ petitioners to have

an opportunity for advancement in their career is under consideration by the applicants.

**5.** Such being the position, this Court is inclined to grant some more time to the applicants. Accordingly, the time for complying the common judgment and order dated 01.04.2025 stands extended for another period of 04(four) months from today. It is also made clear that no further extension of time will be granted.

**6.** With the above observations and direction, the application stands disposed of.

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**