

GAHC040017012024



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

Case No. : IA(C)/246/2024

Rajiv Gauba and 6 Ors
the Cabinet, Secretary to the Govt of India, Cabinet Secretariat, Rashtrapati Bhawan,
New Delhi 110004

2: Giridhar Aramane

Age:

Occupation :

Defence Secretary

Ministry of Defence

Govt of India

101 A

South block

New Delhi 110011

3: G S Rajeswaran

Age:

Occupation :

Director General

Defence Estates

Raksha Sampada Bhawan

Ulaanbaatar Road

Ministry of Defence

New Delhi 110010

4: S N Gupta

Age:

Occupation :

Principal Director

Defence Estates

Eastern Command

Ministry of Defence

13 Camac Street

7th Floor

Kolkata 700013

5: Koli Akash Santosh

Age:

Occupation :

Defence Estates Officer

Itanagar Circle

Camp at model Village Naharlagun

Arunachal Pradesh 791110

6: Kiran S Rahul

Age:

Occupation :

Commanding Officer

8th Maratha Light Infantry Regiment

Tuting

Upper Siang District

Arunachal Pradesh.

7: Anurag Panwar

Age:

Occupation :

Commanding Officer

4/1 Gurkha Regiment

Rayang

under Sub Division-Ruksin

East Siang District

Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

Dondup Jamchen and 2 Ors

Son of Chime Dorjee, resident of Gelling Village, PO and PS Tuting, Upper Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh.

2:Pankaj Kumar Jha

Age: 0

Occupation :

Secretary

Land Management

Govt of Arunachal Pradesh

Itanagar

PO and PS Itanagar

Papum Pare District

Arunachal Pradesh.

3:Hage Lailang

Age: 0

Occupation :
Deputy Commissioner
Yingkiong
Upper Siang District
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
PO and PS Yingkiong
Arunachal Pradesh

Advocate for the Petitioner : M Barman,

Advocate for the Respondent : Oken Duggong,

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN**

ORDER

Date : 09.12.2024

Heard Ms. A. Gayan, learned counsel for the applicant. Also heard Mr. O. Duggong, learned counsel, for the opposite party.

This interlocutory application is preferred for striking out the name of the respondent No. 1, namely, Shri Rajiv Gauba, Cabinet Secretary to the Govt. of India from the array of the petition in contempt case, being Cont.Cas(C) No. 27(AP)/2023.

Ms. Gayan, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is not a necessary party in the contempt petition and as such, his name may be deleted from the array of the contempt petition, being Cont.Cas(C) No. 27(AP)/2023.

Mr. O. Duggong, learned counsel for the opposite party/sole respondent No.

1 submits that he has no objection in the event of deleting the name of the applicant from the array of the contempt petition.

In view of the submission of learned counsel for both the parties, also considering the facts and circumstances on the record, this Court is inclined to allow this interlocutory application. The name of the applicant be struck off from the array of the contempt petition, being Cont.Cas(C) No. 27(AP)/2023.

In terms of above, this Interlocutory application stands closed.

The petitioner to make necessary correction in the connected contempt case, being Cont.Cas(C) No. 27(AP)/2023, in view of the order passed in IA(C) No. 246(AP)/2024.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant