

GAHC040011362023



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

Case No. : IA(C)/147/2023

Bedik Yayu, D/O Lt. Talom Tanak
D/o Late Talom Tanak, R/O Hoba Village, PO-Damin, Kurungkumey. Presently r/o
Chimpu, PO/PS-Itanagar, Dist-Papumpare, Arunachal Pradesh. Mob. No. 9362555986

VERSUS

Bedik Tade, S/O Lt. Bedik Tagak
S/o Late Bedik Tagak, R/O Huba Village, PO-Damin, PS-Koloriang, Dist-
Kurungkumey, C/O Shri Bedik Tagar, S/O Lt. Bedik Tanam, Karsingsha, PO/PS-
Banderdewa, District Papum Pare, Arunachal Pradesh. C/O Shri Bedik Chapop,
Dikrong Colony, Nirjuly, District Papum Pare, Arunachal Pradesh.

Advocate for the Petitioner : Morrik Bagra, Legal Aid Counsel

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN DEV CHOUDHURY

ORDER

Date : 29-10-2024

Heard Mr. T. Rar, learned counsel for the applicant.

The present application is filed under Section 5 of the Limitation act, 1963 for condonation of delay of 4(four) days in preferring the

connected civil revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

In the considered opinion of this Court, there is no prescription under Limitation Act prescribing any period for preferring an application under Article 227 of the Constitution of India inasmuch as such power is supervisory power of this Court. However, it is needless to say that this Court may not entertain an application under Article 227 of the Constitution of India when the petition is hit by unreasonable delay and laches on the part of petitioner and not for any prescription under the Limitation Act.

Be that as it may, considering the above, it is provided that the petition cannot be said to be unreasonably delayed and therefore, this Court is of the view that the present application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act is not necessary to be filed in the connected petition.

Accordingly, the present interlocutory application stands closed.

Civil revision petition be listed in the motion column reflecting the name of the learned counsel for the respondent.

JUDGE