

GAHC040000522026



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

**Case No. : IA(C)/18/2026**

Licha Tai and 12 Ors  
Son of Late Licha Tanam, Village Dem, PO Deed, Keyi Panyor District, Arunachal Pradesh      2: Licha Tagu

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Shri Licha Tado

Village Dem

PO Deed

Keyi Panyor District

Arunachal Pradesh

3: Toko Joseph

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Toko jerjo

Village Dem

PO Deed

Keyi Panyor District

Arunachal Pradesh

4: Byabang Hipik

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Byabang Taniam

Village Dem

PO Deed

Keyi Panyor District

Arunachal Pradesh

5: Licha Tanam

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Licha Tegi

Village Dem  
PO Deed  
Keyi Panyor District  
Arunachal Pradesh

6: Smti Khoda Yok  
Age:  
Occupation :  
Wife of Shri Khoda Tayo  
Village Dem  
PO Deed  
Keyi Panyor District  
Arunachal Pradesh

7: Licha Epo  
Age:  
Occupation :  
Son of Late Licha Tegi  
Village Dem  
PO Deed  
Keyi Panyor District  
Arunachal Pradesh

8: Khoda Talam  
Age:  
Occupation :  
Son of Late Khoda Tagio  
Village Dem  
PO Deed  
Keyi Panyor District  
Arunachal Pradesh

9: Khoda Tagam  
Age:  
Occupation :  
Son of Late Khoda Tacho  
Village Dem  
PO Deed  
Keyi Panyor District  
Arunachal Pradesh

10: Neelam Tayo  
Age:  
Occupation :  
Son of Late Neelam Teyi  
Village Dem  
PO Deed  
Keyi Panyor District

Arunachal Pradesh

11: Licha Palo

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Shri Licha Terin

Village Dem

PO Deed

Keyi Panyor District

Arunachal Pradesh

12: Pingam Licha

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Shri Licha Ekhin

Village Dem

PO Deed

Keyi Panyor District

Arunachal Pradesh

13: Licha Erin

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Licha Tatam

Village Dem

PO Deed

Keyi Panyor District

Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

The State of AP and 4 Ors

represented by the Secretary, Land Management, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar

791112: The Deputy Commissioner

Age: 0

Occupation :

Lower Subansiri District

Ziro

Arunachal Pradesh 791120

3: The Chief Engineer (Highway)

Age: 0

Occupation :

PWD

Western Zone

Govt of Arunachal Pradesh

Itanagar. 791111

4: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 11001

5:The National Highway and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited  
Age: 0  
Occupation :  
represented by the Managing Director  
3rd Floor  
PTI Building  
4 Parliament Street  
New Delhi 11000

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : Subu Koyang,

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

**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 19 days in preferring the appeal against the Judgement and order dated 19.11.2025 passed in WP(C) No.466(AP)/2024.

**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 19 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.466(AP)/2024 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 19 days.

**6.** In view of the above submissions, we find it appropriate to condone the delay of 19 days in filing the appeal against the Judgement and order dated 19.11.2025 passed in WP(C) No.466(AP)/2024, being satisfied with the explanation given by the learned counsel for the applicants/appellants.

**7.** Accordingly, IA(C) No.18(AP)/2026 stands allowed and disposed of.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**