



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

Case No. : WP(C)/24/2025

MR. L. WANGNOK KONYAK,
S/O LIPWANG,
R/O CHOAHA CHINGNYU VILLAGE,
PO AND PS ABOI,
DISTIRCT MON, NAGALAND

VERSUS

THE STATE OF NAGALAND AND 3 ORS
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND,
NAGALAND, KOHIMA
2:THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY

DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM

GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND

NAGALAND
KOHIMA

3:THE DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM

NAGALAND
KOHIMA

4:THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER

DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM

NAGALAND
KOHIM

Advocate for the Petitioner : N. MOZHUI, N. RUPREO

Advocate for the Respondent : GOVT ADV NL,

**BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BUDI HABUNG**

ORDER

Date :05-03-2025

Heard Ms. N. Rupreo, learned counsel for the petitioner. I have also heard Mr. N. Angami, learned Government Advocate for the State respondents.

The case of the petitioner is that he was allotted 4 (four) contractual works on 10.02.2014, for construction of Integrated Tourist Travel Circuit at Aboi-Chaohachingngnyu - Changlang-Jakphang- Changlangshu- Sangsangnyu (SH: Construction of Budget Accommodation Morung Type at Chaohachingnyu), Integrated Tourist Travel Circuit at Aboi-Chaohachingngnyu Changlang-Jakphang- Changlangshu-Sangsangnyu (SH: Furnishing of Budget Accommodation at Chaohachingngnyu), Integrated Tourist Travel Circuit at Aboi-Chaohachingngnyu Changlang- Jakphang- Changlangshu-Sangsangnyu (SH: Development of Parking Lot with Cement Concrete at Chaohachingnyu) and Integrated Tourist Travel Circuit at Aboi-Chaohachingngnyu Changlang- Jakphang- Changlangshu- Sangsangnyu. (SH: Construction of Boundary Wall at Chaohachingnyu) amounting to Rs. 68,23,000/- (rupees sixty eight lakhs twenty three thousand) only to be completed within 18 months.

The further case of the petitioner is that he has completed the work within the stipulated time and a Certificate dated 09.12.2024 was issued to this effect by the Village Council. However, even after more than 11 years of the completion of the said work, no payment has been released to the petitioner till date despite of repeated approach being made for releasing the said amounts.

Issue notice of motion calling upon the respondents to show cause as to why a rule should not be issued as prayed for and/or as to why such other order(s) should not be passed as this Court may deem fit and proper.

The notice is made returnable within 4 (four) weeks.

Since Mr. N. Angami, learned Government Advocate accepted notice on behalf of all the respondents, no formal notice need be issued to the said respondents. However, the petitioner shall furnish requisite copies of the petition to the learned Government Advocate during the course of the day.

List this matter after 4 (four) weeks.

Sd/-
JUDGE

Comparing Assistant