

GAHC020000022026



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

Case No. : WP(C)/1/2026

SMTI THUNGBENI
SWEEPER (RTD) RESIDENT OF ELUMYO VILLAGE, WOKHA
NAGALAND

VERSUS

STATE OF NAGALAND AND 6 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVT. OF NAGALAND,
KOHIMA NAGALAND

2:THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY
GOVT. OF NAGALAND
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS
MKOHIMA NAGALAND

3:THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSIONER
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COORDINATION
KOHIMA NAGALAND

4:THE FINANCE COMMISSION
NAGALAND KOHIMA

5:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
WOKHA NAGALAND

6:THE ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONER
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COORDINATION
KOHIMA NAGALAND

7:THE DISTRICT PLANNING OFFICER

DISTRICT PLANNING MACHINERY CELL
WOKHA NAGALAN

Advocate for the Petitioner : JOSHUA SHEQI, A HUKAVI SUMI, TUNATO YEPTHO, R
WONCHIBENI TSANGLO, KIVITOLI SWU, YEKA SUMI, KEVI KIRE, KETHO
SEKHOSE, K LILY SWU, KEDI KOSO, P MHONBENI EZUNG, ATOKA, MIKA H
AYE, CHINGMEI KONYAK, NAGALI SHOHE

Advocate for the Respondent : GOVT ADV NL,

BEFORE
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE YARENJUNGLA LONGKUMER

ORDER

15.01.2026

Heard Ms. Mika Aye, learned counsel for the petitioner.

The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner claiming regularization of service. It is the case of the petitioner that she was appointed on contingency basis vide Order dated 29.10.1987 and thereafter she was granted scale of pay by another Order dated 22.12.2011 and she has been retired from service after serving for 35 (thirty-five) years. The petitioner had also approached this Court earlier vide WP(C)/176/2024, which was disposed of on the basis of a written instruction given to the Government Advocate concerned from the Government stating that the claim of the petitioner and two other similarly situated persons who had been appointed on contingency basis prior to 06.06.2016 will be covered by the Notification No. AR/LEGAL-5/8/2024 dated 05.03.2025 and that they will be granted scale of pay as per the Revision of Pay 2015 subject to fulfillment of the conditions laid down therein. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that

inspite of this assurance by the Government and inspite of the fact that writ petition, WP(C)/176/2024 was disposed of in view of the said assurance the State respondents have again issued the impugned Notification dated 20.09.2025, by which it was stated that the service of the petitioner will not be covered under the Office Memorandum (OM) dated 05.03.2025, in view of the fact that the OM is effective only from 01.04.2025. Being aggrieved the petitioner has approached this Court.

Learned Government Advocate, Bichano Kithan appears for the respondents and accepts notice on behalf of all the respondents.

Accordingly no formal notice is called for; however, the learned counsel for the petitioner shall serve extra copies of the writ petition on the Government Advocate during the course of the day.

List after 4 (four) weeks alongwith WP(C)/256/2025.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant