

GAHC040003722024



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

Case No. : WP(C)/117/2024

Bengia Pacha and 19 Ors
Son of Late Bengia Kyochak, Tayang Village, PO and PS Koloriang, District Kurung
kumey, Arunachal Pradesh

2: Bengia Tapung

Age:

Occupation :

3: Bengia Robin

Age:

Occupation :

4: Bengia Takar

Age:

Occupation :

5: Bengia Kamsing

Age:

Occupation :

6: Tamin Tatu

Age:

Occupation :

7: Yangfo Tabin

Age:

Occupation :

8: Yangfo Tasar

Age:

Occupation :

9: Pisa Mama

Age:

Occupation :

10: Pisa Tabin

Age:

Occupation :

11: Milli Meyang

Age:

Occupation :

12: Milli Dangdang

Age:

Occupation :

13: Milli Tagh

Age:

Occupation :

14: Milli Kaha

Age:

Occupation :

15: Sharma Ale

Age:

Occupation :

16: Sharma Kejik

Age:

Occupation :

17: Sape Mama

Age:

Occupation :

18: Sape Pema

Age:

Occupation :

19: Chello Sagung

Age:

Occupation :

20: Nisso kaha

Age:

Occupation

VERSUS

The Union of India and 14 Ors

represented by its Secretary, Ministry of Home Affair, Govt of India

2:The

Secretary

Age: 0

Occupation :

3:The Director

Age: 0

Occupation :

4:The Second-in-Command

Age: 0

Occupation :

5:The State of Arunachal Pradesh

Age: 0

Occupation :

6:The Deputy Commisisoner

Age: 0

Occupation :

7:The Chief Enigneer

Age: 0

Occupation :

8:The Superintending Engineer

Age: 0

Occupation :

9:The Nodal Officer (VVP)

Age: 0

Occupation :

10:The Executive Engineer cum Project Implementing Unit (PIU)

Age: 0

Occupation :

11:Nisso Rui

Age: 0

Occupation :

12:Bengia Tallar

Age: 0

Occupation :

13:Millo Choga

Age: 0

Occupation :

14:Watlin Gedey

Age: 0

Occupation :

15:Milli Meying

Age: 0

Occupation

Advocate for the Petitioner : Lissing Perme

Advocate for the Respondent : Marto Kato

**BEFORE
HONBLE MRS. JUSTICE SUSMITA PHUKAN KHAUND**

ORDER

Date : 10.05.2024

Heard Mr. S. Yirang, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. M. Kato, learned DSGI for respondent No. 1; Ms. P. Pangu, learned Government Advocate for the respondent No. 5 and Mr. G. Tarak, learned Standing Counsel, RWD, for the respondent Nos. 5, 7, 8, 9 & 10.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for withdrawal of the petition with a liberty to file a fresh petition.

The learned counsel for the respondents has no objection on the prayer of the petitioner for withdrawal of this instant petition.

Prayer is allowed.

Writ petition stands dismissed on withdrawal with a liberty to file a fresh petition.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant