

GAHC040014422024



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

Case No. : WA/27/2024

Bengia Talo
Son of Late Bengia Talum, Pappu Nallah, PO Naharlagun, PS Papum Pare
District, Arunachal Pradesh.

VERSUS

The State of AP and 6 Ors
represented through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar.

2:The Deputy Commissioner cum Revenue Officer

Age: 0
Occupation :
Capital Complex
Itanagar
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

3:The Director of Land Management

Age: 0
Occupation :
Capital Complex
Itanagar
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

4:Aying Perme

Age: 0
Occupation :
Extra Assistant Commissioner
Capital Complex
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

5:The Art of Living Society

Age: 0
Occupation :
Jully

Itanagar
represented by Shri Brahmachar Ravider (Ashram in charge) PO and PS Itanagar
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh.

6:Nabam Tamar
Age: 0
Occupation :
Son of Late Nabam Talo
Jullang Village
PO and PS Itanagar
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh.

7:Smti Nabam Yaja
Age: 0
Occupation :
Wife of Late Nabam Talo
Jullang Village
PO and PS Itanagar
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh

Advocate for the Petitioner : Michi Nibo,

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP),

BEFORE

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NELSON SAILO
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BUDI HABUNG**

O R D E R

16.09.2025

(N. Sailo, J)

Heard Mr. M. Nibo, learned counsel for the appellant, who submits that by filing this writ appeal, the appellant who was the writ petitioner, has challenged the judgment and order dated 25.09.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in WP(C) No.335(AP)/2022. Referring to the impugned judgment and order, the learned counsel for the appellant

submits that the Revenue Officer (respondent No.2) under the Arunachal Pradesh (Land Settlement and Records) Act, 2000 does not have the power to adjudicate the land dispute between two private individuals. Therefore, although the order of the respondent No.2 was challenged, the learned Single Judge has accepted the impugned order of respondent No.2 in so far as adjudication was concerned, but rejected the part of the order by which eviction has been directed. Aggrieved, the writ petitioner is before this Court in this appeal.

In view of above, issue notice returnable by three weeks.

Ms. P. Sangeeta, learned Junior Government Advocate, Arunachal Pradesh accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

Appellant to serve requisite copies of the memo of appeal to the learned counsel appearing today for the respondents.

Appellant to take steps for service of notice upon respondent Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7 by registered post with A/D within three days.

List the matter after three weeks on a date to be fixed by the Registry.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant