

GAHC040018302024



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

Case No. : WP(C)/611/2024

M/s B M Store
represented by Shri Kholie Hania, attorney holder of M/s B M Store, Son of Shri
Kholie Tayo, a permanent resident of Upper Jumi, PO Kimin, PS Kimin, Papum Pare
District, Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

The State of AP and 3 Ors
represented through the Secretary, rural Development, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh,
Itanagar. 2:The Director
Age: 0
Occupation :
Rural Development
Papum Pare District
Yupia
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

3:The Project Director
Age: 0
Occupation :
Rural Development
Papum Pare District
Yupia
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

4:The Deputy Commissioner
Age: 0
Occupation :
Papum Pare District
Yupia
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh

Advocate for the Petitioner : Puto Bui, Talu Kamsar,M Bui

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP), SC (RD),Binter Picha

Linked Case : IA(C)/265/2024

M/s B M Store

Age: 0

Occupation :

Address:represented by Shri Kholie Hania

attorney holder of M/s B M Store

Son of Shri Kholie Tayo

a permanent resident of Upper Jumi

PO Kimin

PS Kimin

Papum Pare District

Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

The State of AP and 3 Ors

Age: 0

Occupation :

Address:represented through the Secretary

rural Development

Govt of Arunachal Pradesh

Itanagar.

2:The Director

Age: 0

Occupation :

Address:Rural Development

Papum Pare District

Yupia

Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

3:The Project Director

Age: 0

Occupation :

Address:Rural Development

Papum Pare District

Yupia

Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

4:The Deputy Commissioner

Age: 0

Occupation :
Address: Papum Pare District
Yupia
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

Advocate for : Puto Bui
Advocate for : GA (AP) appearing for The State of AP and 3 Ors: Advocate ,

,

, appearing for 2,

3,

4, respectively.

-BEFORE-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BUDI HABUNG

20.03.2025

Heard Mr. P. Bui, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. B. Picha, learned Standing counsel for the Rural Development Department representing respondent Nos. 1, 2 & 3 and Mr. R. H. Nabam, learned Addl. Advocate General representing respondent No. 4.

Mr. Nabam, learned Addl. Advocate General submits that after cancellation of the impugned order, the District Urban Development Agency being the Nodal Department has already advertised for walk-in-interview for various posts in FTI, A.P. on 22.12.2024 and by this time, the recruitment process must have been completed.

Mr. Bui, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they have challenged the advertisement for walk-in-interview dated 22.12.2024, in WP (C) 09 (AP) 2025. He further submits that although there is no stay order against the advertisement for walk-in-interview, however, it was

observed that the recruitment of the various posts in FTI, A.P. shall be subject to the outcome of the said writ petition.

In view of the above, let the WP (C) 09 (AP) 2025 be tagged with the present writ petition.

As prayed for by the learned counsel for the parties, list the matter on 22.04.2025 along with WP (C) 09 (AP) 2025.

In the meantime, the respondents shall file affidavit showing the status of the recruitment process of various posts in FTI, A.P. in pursuant to the advertisement dated 22.12.2024.

At this stage, Mr. Nabam, learned Addl. Advocate General representing respondent No. 4 raised the *locus-standi* of the petitioner and in that regard, the respondent is at liberty to file an I.A., if so advised.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant