

GAHC040000682026



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

Case No. : IA(C)/25/2026

Sushil Nalo and 15 Ors

Son of Late Pagram Nalo, Resident of Tapang Gyama Colony, PO Daporijo District
Upper Subansiri, Arunachal Pradesh 2: Konam Bayor

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Tako Bayor

Resident of Dumporijo

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

3: Takak Riddi

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Tabin Riddi

Resident of Tigre Colony

PO Daporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

4: Pekka Kadu

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Shri Tapek Kadu

resident of Forest Colony

PO Daporijo

Upper Subansiri District

Arunachal Pradesh.

5: Dr Sogi Muri

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Tasso Muri

Resident of Medical Colony
PO Daporijo
District Upper Subansiri
Arunachal Pradesh.

6: Smti Yapu Rilo

Age:

Occupation :

Wife of Sri Kogo Rilo

Resident of Dumporijo

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

7: Jumpak Uli

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Tajum Uli

Resident of Kuporijo

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

8: Yukpo Baja

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Tayuk Baja

Resident of Baja Village

PO Gepen

District Kamle

Arunachal Pradesh.

9: Tamar Yudik

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Sri Taper Yudik

Resident of Krishna Colony

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

10: Smti Mapi Dugi

Age:

Occupation :

Wife of Late Kaklom Dugi

Resident of Kuporijo

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

11: Nyapi Haji

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Tania Haji

Resident of Golden Market

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

12: Sagge Dugi

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Tagam Dugi

Resident of Kuporijo

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

13: Smti Gamchuk Garam

Age:

Occupation :

Wife of Sri Talin Leya Garam

Resident of Teacher Colony

PO Daporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

14: Takar Ruyi

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Sri Tayo Ruyi

Resident of Chota Rupok Village

PO Dumporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

15: Taje Konia

Age:

Occupation :

Son of Late Tarik Konia

Resident of Sigin Colony Part I

PO Daporijo

District Upper Subansiri

Arunachal Pradesh.

16: Albert Mra

Age:
Occupation :
Son of Late Nyamin Mra
Resident of Kupurijo
PO Daporijo
District Upper Subansiri
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. 791111

3:The Deputy Commissioner

Age: 0
Occupation :
Lower Subansiri District
Ziro
Arunachal Pradesh 7911120

4:The Chief Engineer (Highway)

Age: 0
Occupation :
Western Zone
PWD
Itanagar
Arunachal Pradesh 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), Rintu Saikia,SC(Highway),DSGI,Marto Kato

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

ORDER

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 27 days in preferring the appeal against the Judgement and order dated 19.11.2025 passed in WP(C) No.247(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 27 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. 247(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 27 days.

6. In view of the above submissions, we find it appropriate to condone the delay of 27 days in filing the appeal against the Judgement and order dated 19.11.2025 passed in WP(C) No. 247(AP)/2023, being satisfied with the explanation given by the learned counsel for the applicants/appellants.

7. Accordingly, IA(C) No.25(AP)/2026 stands allowed and disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant