



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

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/118/2023

SMTI. S. CHONGJI PHOM,
W/O LT. KONGPA PHOM,
PONGCHING VILLAGE,
LONGLENG 798625, NAGALAND

VERSUS

THE STATE OF NAGALAND AND 9 ORS
THROUGH THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND,
KOHIMA
2) THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND,
PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS DEPARTMENT,
NAGALAND, KOHIMA
3) THE HOME COMMISSIONER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND,
DEPARTMENT OF HOME, NAGALAND, KOHIMA
4) THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY,
JUSTICE AND LAW DEPARTMENT, NAGALAND, KOHIMA
5) THE FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER,
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND, NAGALAND, KOHIMA
6) THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
NAGALAND, KOHIMA
7) THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
TUENSANG, NAGALAND
8) THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
LONGLENG, NAGALAND
9) THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL,
NAGALAND, KOHIMA
10) THE TREASURY OFFICER,
LONGLENG, NAGALAND

Advocate for the Petitioner : I. IMTI LONGCHAR

Advocate for the Respondent : GOVT ADV NL

**BEFORE
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MARLI VANKUNG**

ORDER

Date : 14.11.2023

Heard Mr. I. Imti Longchar, learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner along with Mr. N. Angami, learned Government Advocate for the State respondent Nos. 1 to 8 & 10.

It is seen that A/D card upon respondent No. 9 is not returned till date. However, the learned Government Advocate submits that they will not be filing their written objection to the application for condonation of a delay of 116 days in filing the Review Petition against this Court's Order dated 28.04.2023 passed in WP(C) No. 61/2019.

Mr. I. Imti Longchar, learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that the reason for the delay of 116 days in filing the Review Petition was due to the fact that a certified true copy of the Order dated 28.04.2023 was received only on 23.05.2023. Thereafter, the learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner had communicated through a messenger to inform about the dismissal of the writ petition to the petitioner. The applicant/petitioner could not travel to Kohima immediately to discuss the need to file a Review Petition due to the fact that the applicant/petitioner was

residing in one of the most remote Districts with improper roads which was worsened by heavy rainfall during June to July. The applicant/petitioner could arrive at her counsel's chamber only on 16.08.2023, after which her learned counsel had taken all necessary steps for filing of the Review Petition. The learned counsel submits that the delay of 116 days was not due to any negligence or laches on the part of the applicant/petitioner.

Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner and in view of the fact that the State respondents have not raised any objection to the condonation of a delay of 116 days in filing the Review Petition, this Court finds it fit to allow the condonation of delay of 116 days being satisfied with the explanation given by the learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner.

Accordingly, I.A.(Civil) No. 118/2023 stands allowed and disposed.

Sd/-
JUDGE

Comparing Assistant