

GAHC040000462026



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

Case No. : IA(C)/15/2026

Wangkom Lowang and 16 Ors
Son of Shri Wapong Lowang, Village Khonsa, PO Khonsa, Tirap District, Arunachal Pradesh. 2: Gongam Socia

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Wingkhom Socia

Village Khonsa

PO Khonsa

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

3: Hangpong Tesia

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Photong Tesia

Village Khonsa

PO Khonsa

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

4: Wangpan Socia

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Shri Wangno Socia

Village Khonsa

PO Khonsa

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

5: Telit Bangsia

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Shri Thowang Bangsia

Village Khonsa
PO Khonsa
District Tirap
Arunachal Pradesh.

6: Miss Potoi Bangsia
Age:
Occupation :
Daughter of Late Longsah Bangsia
Village Khonsa
PO Khonsa
District Tirap
Arunachal Pradesh.

7: Smti Chamat Henkhe
Age:
Occupation :
Wife of Shri Tediap Henkhe
Village Borduria
PO Borduria
District Tirap
Arunachal Pradesh.

8: Rohang Pongtey
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Late K Pongtey
Village Borduria
PO Borduria
District Tirap
Arunachal Pradesh.

9: Wangmok Lowang
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Late Wangley Lowang
Village Borduria
PO Borduria
District Tirap
Arunachal Pradesh.

10: Tekham Matey
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Duwang Matey
Village Borduria
PO Borduria
District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

11: Tephiak Matey

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Teliam Matey

Village Borduria

PO Borduria

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

12: Liatnam Dada

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Sumtang Dada

Village Borduria

PO Borduria

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

13: Somwang Homcha

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Phoaney Homcha

Village Borduria

PO Borduria

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

14: Janghang Matey

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Tephu Matey

Village Borduria

PO Borduria

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

15: Lankham Wangsu

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Sumcho Wangsu

Village Kaimai

PO Kaimai

District Tirap

Arunachal Pradesh.

16: Moloi @ Manloy Lama

Age:
Occupation :
Son of Late Wangdo Lama
Village Borduria
PO Borduria
District Tirap
Arunachal Pradesh.

17: Temno Ruttum
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Late Nahang Ruttum
Village Borduria
PO Borduria
District Tirap
Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

The State of AP and 4 Ors
represented by the Chief Secretary, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar 791111

2:The Secretary

Age: 0
Occupation :
Land Management
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar. 791111

3:The Deputy Commissioner

Age: 0
Occupation :
Tirap District
khonsa
Arunachal Pradesh 792130

4:The Chief Engineer (Highway)

Age: 0
Occupation :
PWD
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar. 791111

5:The Union of India

Age: 0
Occupation :
represented by the Secretary
Ministry of Road Transport and Highway
Govt of India

Transport Bhawan
No.1
Parliament Street
New Delhi 1100

Advocate for the Petitioner : Subu Koyang,

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP), SC(Highway),DSGI,Marto Kato,Rintu Saikia

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE MARLI VANKUNG
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE YARENJUNGLA LONGKUMER

ORDER

Date : 20-01-2026
(Marli, V. J)

Heard Mr. S. Koyang, learned counsel for the applicants/appellants, who has filed the instant application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 for condonation of delay of 17 days in preferring the appeal against the Judgement and order dated 19.11.2025 passed in WP(C) No.392(AP)/2023.

2. Issue notice to the respondents.

3. Since, Mr. N. Ratan, learned Additional Advocate General accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1, 2 and 3, Mr. R. Saikia, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.4 and Mr. N. Sora, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of Mr. M. Kato, learned DSGI representing the respondent No.5, no need to issue formal notice.

4. The learned counsel for the applicants/appellants submits that the

delay of 17 days in filing the appeal against the said Judgment and order dated 19.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in WP(C) No.392(AP)/2023 was not due to any laches and negligence on the part of the applicants/appellants but was due to the time taken for obtaining a certified true copy of the impugned Judgment and order and time taken for preparation of the appeal and getting the signatures of the appellants.

5. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that they have no objection to the condonation of delay of 17 days.

6. In view of the above submissions, we find it appropriate to condone the delay of 17 days in filing the appeal against the Judgement and order dated 19.11.2025 passed in WP(C) No.392(AP)/2023, being satisfied with the explanation given by the learned counsel for the applicants/appellants.

7. Accordingly, IA(C) No.15(AP)/2026 stands allowed and disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant