

GAHC020003432025



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

Case No. : WP(C)/110/2025

THE VILLAGE GUARD ASSOCIATION OF NAGALAND
REPRESENTED BY ITS VICE PRESIDENT, SHRI TONGKAMMAND ITS
EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN SHRI M. LASETSU

VERSUS

STATE OF NAGALAND AND 5 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVT. OF NAGALAND
2:THE UNION OF INDIA
REPRESENTED BY THE STATE SECRETARY (NORTH EAST DIVISION) TO THE
GOVT. OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
NORTH BLOCK NEW DELHI-110001

3:THE ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY AND FINANCE COMMISSIONER
GOVT. OF NAGALAND
CHAIRMAN EXPERT COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE AND DETERMINE THE
PAYMENT/ENTITLEMENT OF VILLAGE GUARDS IN NAGALAND KOHIMA

4:THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY
P AND AR DEPT. NAGALAND KOHIMA

5:THE HOME COMMISSIONER
NAGALAND KOHIMA

6:THE COMMISSIONER OF NAGALAND AND COMMANDANT
GENERAL
VILLAGE GUARDS
NAGALAND KOHIM

Advocate for the Petitioner : TAKA MASA, SR. ADV, ALEMWAPANG
AO,SORENI MOZHUI,SENTILONG,TIAKUMLA,ARENLONG

Advocate for the Respondent : GOVT ADV NL,

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

ORDER

Date : 24-06-2025

Heard Mr. Taka Masa, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr. Sentilong, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. Ajungli Sangtam, learned Government Advocate for the State respondents and Ms. Asi Kire, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. Yangerwati, learned counsel for the respondent no. 2.

The petitioners are engaged as Village Guards by the Government, and are member of a registered Society. They perform the duty of voluntary force for maintaining law and order in the village and also assist the police in curbing criminal activities and apprehending criminals. They are presently being paid Rs. 3000/- per month as an honorarium along with the allowance for clothing and ration. They have been denied minimum wages and pay parity with the Home Guards, despite performing comparable duties.

The petitioner had earlier approached this Court by filing writ petition, which was allowed and directed the respondent authority to consider the case of the petitioners for granting salary at par with the Home guards. Being aggrieved, the State filed appeal, and the Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court set aside the order of the learned Single Judge and directed the constitution of an expert committee to consider enhancement of honorarium.

However, the Expert committee and the reconstituted expert committee did not enhance the honorarium. In the meantime, the petitioners filed a contempt petition, however, the contempt petition was disposed holding that the order of the Court has been complied with and gave liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum in the event the petitioner is aggrieved by the recommendation made by the Expert committee. Being aggrieved with the Expert committee report, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

Issue notices returnable by 4 (four) weeks.

Since Mr. Ajungli Sangtam, learned Government Advocate appears and accepts notice for the State respondents nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and Ms. Asi Kire, learned counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of Mr. Yangerwati, learned counsel for the respondent no. 2, no formal notice need be issued to the said respondents and the services is complete. However, the petitioner shall furnish requisite extra copies of the petition to the learned counsel for the respondents during the course of the day.

List this matter after 4 (four) weeks.

Sd/-
JUDGE

Comparing Assistant