GAHC010160852026

2026:GAU-AS:11424

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

Case No. : WP(C)/4138/2026

ANOWARA BEGUM
W/O DARBESH ALI, R/O HOWLY TOWN, WARD NO. 10, P.O. AND P.S. HOWLY, DIST.- BARPETA, ASSAM, PIN- 781316

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 3 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM, URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, DISPUR, GUWAHATI- 781006.

2:THE DIRECTOR
MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006.

3:THE CHAIRMAN
HOWLY MUNICIPALITY
HOWLY
P.O. HOWLY
DIST. BARPETA
ASSAM.

4:THE HOWLY MUNICIPALITY
HOWLY
REPRESENTED BY ITS EXECUTIVE OFFICER
P.O. HOWLY
DIST. BARPETA
(ASSAM)
PIN- 781316

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. H. Ali, Advocate

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. G. Bokolial, Jr. GA, Assam

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVASHIS BARUAH

ORDER

Date : 12.08.2026

Heard Mr. H. Ali, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner and Mr. G. Bokolial, the learned Junior Government Advocate appearing on behalf of the State Respondents.

2. Mr. H. Ali, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner had submitted a representation on 22.07.2024 to the Executive Officer, Howly Municipality for the purpose of allotment of the room.

3. From a perusal of the notice which was issued to the Petitioner on 12.06.2019, it is apparently clear that the total consideration which the Petitioner was required to pay was Rs.1,00,000/- and out of which Rs.50,000/- was paid by the Petitioner sometime in the year 2019. The Petitioner has not been able to show before this Court that the Petitioner had paid the remaining amount of Rs.50,000/-. It is also seen that in the representation dated 22.07.2024 which was submitted almost

two years back, there is no whisper that the total amount of Rs.1,00,000/- has been paid.

4. The Petitioner has approached this Court in the year 2026 after two years from the date of submission of the representation and in the writ petition also, there is no mention that the Petitioner had paid the entire amount. Be that as it may, the Petitioner has approached this Court being aggrieved on account of not handing over the room.

5. This Court in the above facts, does not find any good ground for issuance of notice in the present proceedings for which the instant writ petition stands dismissed.

6. Before parting with the records, this Court observes that the dismissal of the instant writ petition shall not preclude the Petitioner to submit a fresh representation before the Respondent Authorities more particularly the Executive Officer of the Howly Municipality after payment of the necessary dues, seeking handing over of the room.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant