

GAHC010103162026



undefined

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

Case No. : WP(C)/2799/2026

AMIT DAS
S/O LT. CHINU LAL DAS, R/O VILL.- KANCHANPUR PT- I, P.O. RATAKANDI,
DIST- HAILAKANDI, ASSAM, PIN- 788151.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 8 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM,
DISPUR, GUWAHATI -781006.

2:THE CHAIRMAN
OF STATE LEVEL COMMITTEE (SLC) FOR APPOINTMENT ON
COMPASSIONATE GROUND
DISPUR
GUWAHATI -781006.

3:THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
REVENUE AND D.M. DEPARTMENT
DISPUR
GUWAHATI
PIN- 781006.

4:THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY
TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM
PERSONNEL (B) DEPARTMENT
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 6.

5:THE SECRETARY
TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM
REVENUE AND D.M. (L.R.) DEPARTMENT
ASSAM SECRETARIAT (CIVIL)

DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 6.

6:THE JOINT SECRETARY
TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM
REVENUE AND D.M. (L.R.) DEPARTMENT
ASSAM SECRETARIAT (CIVIL)
DISPUR
GUWAHATI -6.

7:THE SETTLEMENT OFFICER
CACHAR AND HAILAKANDI DIST
SILCHAR
ASSAM

8:THE DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
CACHAR
SILCHAR-CUM-CHAIRMAN
DISTRICT LEVEL COMMITTEE
CACHAR
SILCHAR.

9:THE DIRECTOR
OF LAND RECORDS AND SURVEYS ETC
ASSAM
RUPNAGAR
GUWAHATI 32

Advocate for the Petitioner : MS. S B CHOUDHURY,

Advocate for the Respondent : GA, ASSAM, SC, REVENUE

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOUMITRA SAIKIA

ORDER

01.06.2026

Heard Ms. SB Choudhury, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Issue Notice, returnable by 4 (four) weeks.

Mr. JK Goswami, learned Additional Senior Government Advocate, Assam appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.1, 2, 4, 7 & 8 and Mr. J Handique learned Standing Counsel, Revenue Department appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents no. 3, 5, 6 & 9.

Since all the respondents are represented by their respective counsel, notices are waived. However, extra copies be furnished to them within 1 (one) week from today.

Learned counsel for the respondents are permitted to obtain their required instructions in the matter in respect of the claims made by the writ petitioner that since the petitioner had submitted his claim for compassionate appointment well within time, the SLC could not have rejected his case on the grounds of having submitted belated claim. The proposal of the petitioner was rejected as the authorities held that it would not be considered after a lapse of 13 (thirteen) years as the conditions of immediacy was no longer in existent.

List the matter after 4 (four) weeks.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant