

GAHC020005882026



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

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/171/2026

SHRI LUCKSON SUMI
S/O LATE P.K. LAXMAN, R/O HOUSE NO. C-76, BLOCK - V, THILIXU VILLAGE,
CHUMOUKEDIMA, NAGALAND

VERSUS

STATE OF NAGALAND AND 2 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVT. OF NAGALAND, KOHIMA,
NAGALAND 2:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
LONGLENG
NAGALAND

3:AGGRIEVED PARTY
C/O THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
LONGLENG
NAGALAN

Advocate for the Petitioner : TOIKA A YEPTHOMI,

Advocate for the Respondent : GOVT ADV NL,

Linked Case : WP(C)/67/2025

SHRI LUCKSON SUMI
S/O LATE P.K.LAXMAN
R/O H.NO. C-76
BLOCK V
THILIXU VILLAGE
CHUMOUKEDIMA

NAGALAND

VERSUS

STATE OF NAGALAND AND 2 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF NAGALAND

2:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
LONGLENG NAGALAND

3:AGGRIEVED PARTY
C/O THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
LONGLENG NAGALAND

Advocate for : A. ZHIMOMI
Advocate for : GOVT ADV NL appearing for STATE OF NAGALAND AND 2 ORS

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANJAN MONI KALITA

ORDER

Date : 03.08.2026

Heard Ms. Lhousino, learned counsel appearing for the applicant. Also heard Mr. L.T. Sangtam, learned Addl. Advocate General for the State of Nagaland, representing the respondent nos. 1 & 2 as well as Mr. Pheniang Lushing, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no. 3.

2. By filing this instant application, the applicant submits that a meeting took place involving the Deputy Commissioner, Longleng, the private respondent, the applicant, and other aggrieved parties. It is submitted that though she had attended the meeting, she was unaware of the minutes of the meeting and she got to know about a particular resolution only after an affidavit-in-opposition has been filed in the connected writ petition by the respondent No. 3. In view of the aforesaid, the learned counsel submits that the applicant should be

allowed to include a new paragraph in the connected writ petition. The paragraph she is praying for inclusion is as follows:

“13(a) That the Minutes dated 24.09.2024 was not recorded in the presence of the petitioner and she was not furnished with a copy of the same. He had no knowledge of the same until the receipt of the affidavit-in-opposition filed by the respondent no. 3, in the instant case. The Minutes dated 24.09.2024, issued by the Deputy Commissioner, Longleng is in violation of the procedure prescribed by law. The claim of the opposite party no. 3 must be tried and tested, in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law. That too, after taking into account, the counter claim of the applicant. Therefore, the Minutes dated 24.09.2024 is illegal, without jurisdiction and non-est in law.”

3. In view of the aforesaid prayer for inclusion of the new paragraph, a consequent prayer has also been made for inclusion in the prayer portion of the connected writ petition. The same is as follows: -

“Quash and set aside: (i) Meeting Minutes No.DC/DEV/LLG/2/LANE/CTN-LLG/2024/766 dated 24.09.2024 recorded by the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Longleng.”

4. The learned counsel appearing for the opposite parties do not object to such prayer and therefore, the instant application is disposed of with a direction to include the aforesaid paragraph of 13(a) in the writ petition, as well as the prayer as mentioned above, in the prayer portion of the writ petition.

5. In view of allowance of the instant I.A., the learned counsel for the petitioner shall file an amended writ petition within a period of one

week.

6. The instant I.A. is disposed of.
7. Let the writ petition be listed again after two (2) weeks.

Sd/-

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant