GAHC040013072025

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

Case No. : WP(C)/356/2025

Petring Nyodo
Son of Late Punggu Nyodo, permanent resident of Bomdo Village, PO and PS Jengging, Upper Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh.

VERSUS

The State of AP and 3 Ors
represented by the Chief Secretary, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar. 2:The Secretary Land Department
Age: 0
Occupation :
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

3:The Deputy Commissioner
Age: 0
Occupation :
Upper Siang District
Yingkiong
Arunachal Pradesh.

4:The District Land Revenue and Settlement Officer
Age: 0
Occupation :
Upper Siang District
Yingkiong
Arunachal Pradesh

Advocate for the Petitioner : Orin Modi, Ajit Bonia,Duram Miyu,Nabam Hari,Noni Nobeng

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP),

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MEDHI

ORDER

Date : 31-08-2026

Heard Shri O. Modi, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Ms G. Ete, learned Additional Senior Government Advocate for the State of Arunachal Pradesh.

2. Considering the facts and circumstances involved, the present writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage.

3. As per the facts projected, certain lands of the petitioner were acquired at Chainage No.113.806 for construction and widening of Dite-Dime-Migging Road in the district of Upper Siang. The petitioner is claiming a compensation of Rs.30,17,766/-(Rupees Thirty Lakhs Seventeen Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty Six only) which includes 100% solatium and 12% of interest. However, the compensation offered was meagre, for which, he has submitted a representation dated 20.06.2025, which has not been taken into consideration.

4. Ms Ete, learned State counsel by referring to the affidavit-in-opposition filed by the respondent Nos.3 and 4 on 04.04.2026 has, however, submitted that the amount claimed by the petitioner was accordingly to the first assessment. However, since there were certain irregularities in the first assessment, another assessment has been done as per which the entitlement is about Rs.10 Lakhs (approx.). The learned State counsel submits that the present claim is without any basis and

accordingly, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. After hearing the rival contentions advanced in the Bar, this Court is of the opinion that the decisions taken by the authorities are necessary to be communicated to the petitioner in accordance with law. Such communication can be done by consideration and disposal of the representation dated 20.06.2025, wherein reasons are also required to be assigned for arriving at the conclusion.

6. The writ petition accordingly, stands disposed of by directing, consideration and disposal of the representation of the petitioner, submitted on 20.06.2025, by the Deputy Commissioner, Yingkiong, which has to be done expeditiously and preferably within a period of 60(Sixty) days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. The Deputy Commissioner, Yingkiong, would also give the petitioner an opportunity of personal hearing before arriving at the decision which is required to be communicated as indicated above.

7. The writ petition stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant