

GAHC010027312016



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

Case No. : WP(C)/6216/2016

THE UPPER ASSAM MOTOR TRANSPORT OWNER'S ASSOCIATION
PREVIOUSLY KNOWN AS UPPER ASSAM UNDER ASTC BUS OWNER'S
ASSOCIATION. REP. BY ITS EX EXECUTIVE PRESENT PRESINJIT KAKOTI.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 4 ORS
REP. BY THE ADDL. CHIEF SECRETARY TRANSPORT DEPTT., GOVT. OF
ASSAM, DISPUR, GUWAHATI -06.

2:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
DIBRUGARH
ASSAM.

3:THE DISTRICT TRANSPORT OFFICER DTO
DIBRUGARH DISTRICT
DIBRUGARH
ASSAM.

4:THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
DIBRUGARH
DIST. DIBRUGARH.

5:THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE TRAFFIC BRANCH
DIBRUGARH SADAR POLICE STATION
DIBRUGARH

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR.D HALOI, MR.A SAHAD,MR.S A HUSSAIN,MS.A DEKA

Advocate for the Respondent : SC, TRANSPORT, ADDL. AG, ASSAM,MR.Y DOLOI(R- 1-5),GA,
ASSAM

Linked Case : WP(C)/3294/2012

THE UPPER ASSAM UNDER ASTC BUS OWNERS ASSOCIATION
UPPER ASSAM
REP.BY ITS CHIEF COORDINATOR SHRI PRASANTA KAKOTY SON OF LATE
JATIN KAKOTY R/O CHIRING CHAPORI P.O. and P.S. DIBRUGARH
DIST. DIBRUGARH
ASSAM.

VERSUS

STATE OF ASSAM and ORS.
REP. BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM
TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT
DISPUR
GUWAHATI-6.

2:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

DIBRUGARH
DIST. DIBRUGARH
ASSAM.

3:THE DISTRICT TRANSPORT OFFICER

DIBRUGARH
ASSAM.

4:THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE

DIBRUGARH
ASSAM.

5:THE CHAIRMAN

DIBRUGARH MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
DIBRUGARH.

6:THE OFFICER-IN-CHARGE

DIBRUGARH SADAR P.S. DIBRUGARH
ASSAM.

Advocate for : MS.R GOGOI
Advocate for : GA
ASSAM appearing for STATE OF ASSAM and ORS.

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KARDAK ETE**

ORDER

Date : 05-05-2026

None appears for the petitioners on call.

Ms. M. D. Borah, learned Standing Counsel, Transport Department and Mr. H. K. Hazarika, learned Government Advocate for respondent Nos. 4 & 5, are present.

The matters pertain to a decision to discontinue the petitioners, who are an association of bus owners, from being allowed a bus stoppage near the PWD Office, Dibrugarh.

The petitioners remain unrepresented despite the matters being pending since 2012 and having subsequently filed another writ petition in the year 2016.

Considering the above, it appears that the petitioners are no longer interested in pursuing the matter and at the same time, the issue involved is a trivial one. Accordingly, the writ petitions stand dismissed for non-prosecution.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant