

GAHC020008952025



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

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/253/2025

SMTI Y. SETHRONGLA
D/O YANGTONGSE, RESIDENTY OF DUNCAN BOSTI, DIMAPUR,
NAGALAND, MULTI TASKING STAFF (OFFICE PEON) OFFICE OF
THE SUPERINTENDENT, EXCISE AND PROHIBITION, DIMAPUR
NAGALAND

VERSUS

STATE OF NAGALAND AND 3 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE
GOVT. OF NAGALAND, DEPT. OF EXCISE AND PROHIBITION,
NAGALAND KOHIMA

2:THE COMMISSIONER
EXCISE AND PROHIBITION
NAGALAND DIMAPUR

3:TRHE SUPERINTENDENT
EXCISE AND PROHIBITION
DIMAPUR
NAGALAND

4:MR. ATHOBU MEYASE
S/O RULIE MEYASE
R/O RULIE MEYASE
R/O TSUUMA VILLAGE
P.O. MEDZHIPHEMA
CHUMOUKEDIMA
NAGALAN

Advocate for the Petitioner : SENTIYANGER,

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

Linked Case : WA/50/2025

SMTI. Y. SETHRONGLA
D/O YANGTONGSE
RESIDENTY OF DUNCAN BOSTI
DIMAPUR
NAGALAND
MULTI TASKING STAFF (OFFICE PEON) OFFICE OF THE
SUPERINTENDENT
EXCISE AND PROHIBITION
DIMAPUR NAGALAND

VERSUS

STATE OF NAGALAND AND 3 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE
GOVT. OF NAGALAND
DEPT. OF EXCISE AND PROHIBITION
NAGALAND KOHIMA

2:THE COMMISSIONER
EXCISE AND PROHIBITION
NAGALAND DIMAPUR

3:TRHE SUPERINTENDENT
EXCISE AND PROHIBITION
DIMAPUR
NAGALAND

4:MR. ATHOBU MEYASE
S/O RULIE MEYASE
R/O RULIE MEYASE
R/O TSUUMA VILLAGE
P.O. MEDZHIPHEMA
CHUMOUKEDIMA
NAGALAND

Advocate for : SENTIYANGER
Advocate for : appearing for STATE OF NAGALAND AND 3 ORS

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BUDI HABUNG

ORDER

21.01.2026

(R. Phukan, J)

Heard Ms. Yukhakovla, learned counsel for the applicant and also heard Ms. Livika, learned Government Advocate appearing on behalf of Ms. Inaholi, learned Government Advocate for the State respondent.

This interlocutory application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act is preferred by the applicant for condonation of delay of 18 (eighteen) days in filing the accompanying appeal.

The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the appeal could not be filed in time as she could not obtain legal advice in time and that the delay is not intentional, rather it is circumstantial and the same has duly been explained in paragraph-3 of the application; and under such circumstances, it is contended that the delay may be condoned and that the appeal may be admitted for hearing.

Ms. Livika submits that she has no objection in the event of condoning delay of 18 (eighteen) days in preferring the connected appeal.

Having heard the submissions of the learned counsels of both the parties we have carefully gone through the application and the grounds mentioned herein and it appears that the delay of 18 days is sufficiently

explained and accordingly, the same stands condoned.

In terms of the above, the interlocutory application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant