

GAHC040020672025



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

Case No. : IA(C)/316/2025

The State of AP and 2 Ors
represented by the Chief Secretary, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar. 2: The
Commissioner

Age:

Occupation :

Law and Justice

Govt of Arunachal Pradesh

Itanagar.

3: The Secretary

Age:

Occupation :

Department of Indigenous Affairs

Govt of Arunachal Pradesh

Itanagar

VERSUS

Tambo Tamin

Son of Shri Tako Leriak Tamin, resident of Borum, PO and PS Naharlagun, Papum
Pare District, Arunachal Pradesh.

Advocate for the Petitioner : GA (AP), GA (AP)

Advocate for the Respondent : Lissing Perme,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KARDAK ETE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BUDI HABUNG

ORDER

Date : 24-02-2026
(Kardak Ete, J.)

Heard Mr. I. Choudhury, learned Advocate General assisted by Mr. S. Tapin, learned Senior Government Advocate for the appellant and Mr. L. Perme, learned counsel for the opposite party.

2. This is an application filed by the State of Arunachal Pradesh seeking extension of time to comply with the order dated 30.09.2024, passed in PIL 16/2022.

3. A PIL was filed seeking a direction to frame Rules under Section 8 of the Arunachal Pradesh Freedom of Religion Act, 1978. The matter was disposed of on 30.09.2024 with the hope and expectation that the Rules would be finalized within six (6) months from the date of passing of the order, on being assured by the State authorities.

4. Owing to administrative exigencies, the State filed an interlocutory application, being IA(C) No. 88/2025, seeking extension of time, which was allowed. Accordingly, a further period of 6 (six) months was granted vide order dated 17.06.2025.

5. The learned Advocate General submits that initially a committee, headed by the Home Minister, was constituted, however, the same was opposed by certain stakeholders. Thereafter, the State had to re-constitute another committee headed by a retired Judge of this High Court along with 11 (eleven) other members. He submits that the committee is likely to complete the process

and submit its report within a period of 4 (four) months. He, therefore, prays for a further period of four (4) months to comply with the order of this Court.

6. Mr. L. Perme, learned counsel for the opposite party, while not seriously objecting to the grant of further time, submits that since the matter has been pending since the order dated 30.09.2024 and an extension having been already granted by this Court, any further extension may be granted as a last chance.

7. Having considered the submissions of the learned Advocate General as well as the learned counsel for the opposite party and taking into account that certain administrative processes are required to be undertaken for framing of the Rules and the fact that the State is actively pursuing the matter by constituting a committee headed by a retired Judge of the High Court, we deem it appropriate to extend the time.

8. Accordingly, we grant a further period of 4 (four) months from today for compliance of the order dated 30.09.2024 from today.

9. The interlocutory application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant