

GAHC020003672025



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

**Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/107/2025**

SHRI KEVISENYU ZATSU AND ANR  
SON OF SUOLEHIE ZATSU, R/O T. KHEL, KOHIMA VILLAGE, KOHIMA  
DISTRICT, NAGALAND

2: SHRI MEDOVILIE KHRUOMO ALIAS KENEIU KHRUOMO  
SON OF KEPELHOUCHA  
R/O L.KHEL  
KOHIMA VILLAGE  
KOHIMA NAGALAN

VERSUS

N. LAO SOLO  
NORTH BLOCK, NEAR NORTH POLICE STATION, KOHIMA VILLAGE, KOHIMA  
DISTRICT, NAGALAND

**Advocate for the Petitioner : T. KHEZHIE,**

**Advocate for the Respondent : ,**

Linked Case : C. REVN/3/2025

SHRI KEVISENYU ZATSU AND ANR  
SON OF SUOLEHIE ZATSU  
R/O T. KHEL  
KOHIMA VILLAGE  
KOHIMA DISTRICT  
NAGALAND

2: SHRI MEDOVILIE KHRUOMO ALIAS KENEIU KHRUOMO  
SON OF KEPELHOCHA  
R/O L.KHEL  
KOHIMA VILLAGE  
KOHIMA NAGALAND  
VERSUS

N. LAO SOLO  
NORTH BLOCK  
NEAR NORTH POLICE STATION  
KOHIMA VILLAGE  
KOHIMA DISTRICT  
NAGALAND

-----  
Advocate for : T. KHEZHIE  
Advocate for : R. IRALU  
SR. ADV appearing for N. LAO SOLO

**BEFORE**  
**HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE YARENJUNGLA LONGKUMER**

**ORDER**

**07/08/2025**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. T. Khezhie.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, Ms. Mhabeni has appeared and made a submission that she has received instructions to appear on behalf of the sole respondent and has already filed her vakalatnama.

3. The present I.A.(C)/107/2025 under Section 5 of the limitation Act 1968 has been filed praying for condonation of 10(ten) days delay in filing the connected C. REVN/3/2025.

4. The counsel for the applicant/petitioners submits that the Deputy

Commissioner, Kohima had heard the Civil Appeal 2/2023 on 24.04.2024 and only after a lapse of one year, the counsel were contacted by the Deputy Commissioner Office on 18.03.2025 to obtain a copy of the Judgment and order in the said appeal. On the same day, a certified true copy of the same was obtained. It is stated that the date of impugned judgment and order is indicated as 11.03.2025. Thereafter, the applicant had communicated to his counsels that they were considering possibilities of settling the dispute amicably outside the court. As no information was forthcoming for a considerable period of time regarding the amicable settlement, it was only on 22.05.2025 that the applicant communicated to the counsels that the efforts towards the settlement did not materialize and that they have decided to pursue the legal remedies available to them.

5. Upon receiving such communication the counsel previously engaged by the applicant had notified the applicant that he had undertaken an official assessment entrusted to him by the Government and that he could not take up the matter and thereafter, the applicant had approached the present counsels on 23.05.2025.

6. During the relevant period of time the present counsel was preoccupied with attending to ailing family members and was out of station for the medical duties, due to which sometime was taken to prepare the present Revision petition. Thereafter, the present counsel made an attempt to file the petition on 16.06.2025, however, on detecting certain discrepancies, further instruction were sought from the applicants and after making necessary

corrections another 10(ten) days was spent in the preparation.

7. It is stated that the limitation period of 90(ninety) days has expired 09.06.2025, if counted from the judgment and order, however the certified true copy of the judgment and order was made available only on 18.03.2025, thus, the limitation period from the date of obtaining the certified true copy will expire on 16.06.2025. Hence, there is total delay on 10(ten) days beyond the prescribed limitation period.

8. It is submitted that the delay has not been deliberate or intentional and the delay was caused beyond the control of the applicants.

9. Learned counsel for the sole respondent submits that she has no objections if the Court condones the delay and has instead submitted that the main revision petition may be heard on merits. Accordingly, this Court is of the view that sufficient cause has been shown by the petitioner for the delay of 10(ten) days. Consequently, the delay of 10(ten) days is condoned and the application is allowed.

Petition stands disposed.

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**