

GAHC030005722025



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

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/152/2025

State of Mizoram and Anr.
R/b the Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram, Public Works Department, Aizawl

VERSUS

Sh Tlangthansanga and Anr.
S/o Sena (L), R/o Bukpui Vengsang, Kolasib District, Mizoram 2:The Engineer-in-Chief

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr C Lalfakzuala

Advocate for the Respondent :

Linked Case : I.A.(Civil)/217/2025

The State of Mizoram
R/b the Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Public Works Department
Aizawl

VERSUS

Sh Tlangthansanga and Anr.
S/o Sena (L)
R/o Bukpui Vengsang
Kolasib District
Mizoram

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. C Lalfakzuala
Advocate for the Respondent :

Linked Case : LA.App./15/2025

The State of Mizoram and Anr.
R/b the Secretary to the Govt. of Mizoram
Public Works Department
Aizawl

2: The Engineer-in-Chief
Public Works Department
Aizawl
Mizoram
VERSUS

Sh Tlangthansanga and Anr.
S/o Sena (L)
R/o Bukpui Vengsang
Kolasib District
Mizoram

2:Sh Lalthantluanga
S/o Rothiauva (L)
R/o Bukpui
Zopui Veng
Kolasib District
Mizoram

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr C Lalfakzuala
Advocate for the Respondent :

B E F O R E
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MARLI VANKUNG
ORDER

03.02.2026

Heard Ms. Lalrosangi, learned counsel for the appellant who submits that

the applicants have made an attempt to serve notice to Private respondent Nos. 1 & 2. However, the Private respondents have refused to accept the notice which is also duly certified by the Village Council/Court, Bukpui. In view of the above submissions, since it appears that notice could not be served upon respondent Nos. 1 & 2 due to the refusal of the respondents to accept the service of notice through dasti mode. This court find it appropriate to proceed with the instant condonation application for a delay of 255 days, in filing the connected appeal against the Judgment & Award dated 10.09.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Kolasib District, Kolasib in L.A case No. 1/2022.

The learned counsel submits that the grounds for delay of 255 days has been explained in detail at para 3 (i) – (xxxi) of the application, wherein, the delay was not due to laches or negligence on the part of the respondent department but it was due to the time taken in obtaining the Certified true copy of the impugned judgment and also time taken to get the advice of the legal Officer engaged in the Department and thereafter engaged the council to represent the appellant department.

This court has perused para 3 (i) – (xxxi) and is satisfied with the explanation given for the delay of 255 days in filing the appeal against the Judgment & Award, dated 10.09.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Kolasib

District, Kolasib in L.A case No. 1/2022.

The delay of 255 days is condoned and I.A (Civil) No. 152/2025 stands allowed and disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant