

GAHC040015472023



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

Case No. : IA(C)/192/2023

M/s Popu Enterprises
having its registered Office at A Sector, Naharlagun, P.O and P.S Naharlagun, District
Papum pare, Arunachal Pradesh, Pin 791110, represented by its Proprietor Shri Pawan
Bagang, S/o Late Tayu Bagang, R/o Naharlagun, District Papum Pare, Arunachal
Pradesh, Pin 791110, Mobile No. 9436048949

VERSUS

M/s Khenewa Group and 4 Ors
Having its Office at Waii Complex, Abotani Colony, Itanagar, Arunachal Pradesh
791110. Represented by its Proprietor Shri Rumak Jomoh, S/o Shri Sam Jomoh, near
Rajdhani Petrol Pump, A Sector, Naharlagun, Papumpare District, Arunachal Pradesh,
PO/PS Naharlagun, Arunachal Pradesh. Mob. No. 9402915867 2:THE STATE OF
AP

Age: 0
Occupation :
represented by the Secretary
Women and Children Development Department
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh
P.O and P.S Itanagar
Pin 791111

3:The Director
Age: 0
Occupation :
Women and Children Development Department
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh
P.O and P.S Itanagar
Pin 791111

4:The Joint Director
Age: 0
Occupation :

Women and Children Development Department
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh
P.O and P.S Itanagar
Pin 791111

5:The Chairperson
Age: 0
Occupation :
Tender Selection Committee
C/o Director
Women and Children Development Department
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh
P.O and P.S Itanagar
Pin 79111

Advocate for the Petitioner : Tad Johnney

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP)

:: BEFORE ::

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHIVJYOTI SAIKIA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. UNNI KRISHNAN NAIR

O R D E R

04.03.2024.

(N. U.K. Nair, J)

Heard the learned counsel Mr. S. Biswakarma appearing for the applicant.

2. This is an application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act praying for condonation of 68 (sixty-eight) days of delay in preferring the present intra-court appeal against the order dated 08.08.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge in WP(C) No.255(AP)/2023.

3. We have perused the contentions as raised in the application along

with the objections as raised thereto by the learned counsel for the private respondent/writ petitioner.

4. The explanations, as put-forth, appears to be satisfactory. The delay having been satisfactorily explained, we are of the view that the present application is required to be allowed by condoning the delay of sixty-eight days in preferring the connected writ appeal.

5. Accordingly, the delay stands condoned.

The present Interlocutory Application stands allowed.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant