

GAHC040000312022



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

Case No. : WP(C) 14/2022

1:Tomin Ete and 2 Ors. S/o Late T. Ete, Resident of Vivek Vihar, Itanagar, P.O/P.S
Itanagar, District Papumpare, Arunachal Pradesh

2: Vijay Passing S/o Ano Passing
Permanent Resident of Parbuk Village
P.O/P.S Roing Lower Dibang Valley District Arunachal Pradesh

3: Sawimso Tayeng S/o Lt. Tuku Tayeng
Permanent Resident of Rangan Village
P.O Hayuliang and P.S Khupa
Anjaw District Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

1:THE STATE OF AP and Anr.
Represented by the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar cum
Chairman, Departmental Promotion Committee held on 31/10/2019

2:The Commissioner/Secretary Hydro Power Development Department
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh Civil Secretariat Itanagar A.P.

Advocate for the Petitioner : Nikita Danggen
O Duggong
P Siga
Y Dagiam
H T Tara

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP)

**BEFORE
HONBLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA**

ORDER

Date : 19.01.2022

Heard Ms. Nikita Danggen, learned counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Ms. Pubi Pangu, learned Government Advocate, appearing on behalf of all the respondents.

Let notice of motion be issued calling upon the respondents to show cause as to why a Rule should not be issued as prayed for; and/or why such further or other order(s) should not be passed as to this Court may deem fit and proper. The notice is made returnable within 6 weeks.

As Ms. Pangu, learned Government Advocate, has accepted notices on behalf of all the respondents; no formal notice is required to be sent to the said respondents. However, she shall be provided with the requisite extra copies of the writ petition during the course of the day.

Needless to say that pendency of this writ petition shall not be a bar for the respondent authorities to consider and dispose of the representations stated to have been submitted by the petitioners.

List it after 6 weeks.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant