

GAHC040013902024



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

Case No. : IA(C)/195/2024

Dr.Mohesh Chai
Son of Late Tanakso Chai, resident of T Chair Residence, Chair Colony, Tezu, PO and
PS Tezu, Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

Karikho Kri
Son of Late Sotri Kri, resident of Kri Niwas, Telluliang village, PO and PS Tezu,
Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh.

Advocate for the Petitioner : Dicky Panging,Daina Tamuk,Marge D,Doge Lona, Kirmar
Ado,Rosy c Lowangcha, Tokge Darin

Advocate for the Respondent : Adam Tatak, Kaling Mibang,Amy Talom,Tsering
Gyatso,Tanur Gao,Tonni Gammi, Logsang Yountan

Linked case : **Election Pet./8/2024**

Karikho Kri
Son of Late Sotri Kri, resident of Kri Niwas, Telluliang Village, PO and PS Tezu,
Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh 792001

VERSUS

Dr Mohesh Chai and 3 Ors
Son of Late Tankakso Chai, resident of T Chai residence, Chai Colony, Tezu, PO and
PS Tezu, Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh 792001 2:Badang Tayang
Age: 43
Occupation :
Son of Shri Banumso Tayang
resident of Telluliang Village
Tezu

PO and PS Tezu
Lohit District
Arunachal Pradesh 792001

3:Ms Jeremai Krong
Age: 0
Occupation :
Daughter of Late Turkho Krong
resident of Changliang Village
Tezu
PO and PS Tezu
Lohit District
Arunachal Pradesh 792001

4:The Returning Officer
Age: 0
Occupation :
for election to State Legislative Assembly for 44 Tezu (ST) Assembly Constituency
Arunachal Pradesh PO and PS Tezu
Lohit District
Arunachal Pradesh 79200

Advocate for the Petitioner : Adam Tatak, Kaling Mibang, Amy Talom, Tsering Gyatso, Tanur Gao, Tonni Gammi, Logsang Yountan

Advocate for the Respondent : Keprunda Mena, Kinyak Loya, Dicky Panging, Daina Tamuk, Marge D, Doge Lona, Kirmar Ado, Rosy c Lowangcha, Tokge Darin, 1 G Saikia, Bulia Pulu, Eho Menjo, N Rama

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KARDAK ETE**

ORDER

Date : 22.10.2024

Heard Mr. D. Panging, learned counsel for the applicant/respondent no.1. Also heard Mr. A. Tatak, learned counsel for the opposite party/election petitioner.

By filing this application under Order XVII Rule 1 of the CPC, the applicant has prayed for adjournment of the election petition for another 10(ten) days for filing of draft issues and documentation.

Having considered the grounds for adjournment and the application not being

opposed by the opposite party/election petitioner, I deem it appropriate to allow the applicant/respondent no.1 granting 10(ten) days time for filing of draft issues and documentations. The applicant/respondent no.1 to file the draft issues and documentation on or before the next date fixed.

Accordingly, the interlocutory application stands allowed and disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant