

GAHC020006452025



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

Case No. : COP(C)/25/2025

SHRI NOKMEI L. PHOM
S/O LATE LONGNYEI PHOM, HUKPHANG VILLAGE, DIST.- LONGLENG,
NAGALAND

VERSUS

SENTIYANGER, IAS AND 2 ORS
CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVT. OF NAGALAND, KOHIMA

2:SHRI TSSURENTHUNG ODYUO THE PRINCIPAL DIRECTOR
TREASURIES AND ACCOUNTS DEPT. NAGALAND KOHIMA

3:SMTI. CHUBASANGLA ANAR
IAS THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY
P AND AR DEPT. NAGALANMD KOHIM

Advocate for the Petitioner : LAKNYEI PHOM, REBECCA,KETI
IMCHEN,KIM PIENYU

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

**BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BUDI HABUNG**

ORDER

Date : 09.12.2025

Heard Mr. Lakneyei Phom, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. N. Angami, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 1, and Mr. Wati Jamir, learned counsel, appearing on behalf of respondent No. 2.

2. This is an application filed under Section 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, read with Contempt of Courts(Gauhati High Court) Rules, 1977, and Article 215 of the Constitution of India, alleging willful and deliberate violation of this Court's order, dated 06.03.2025, passed in WP(c)298(K)2024, whereby, the respondents, more particularly, respondent No. 3 was directed to issue appointment order to the petitioner within a period of 2(two) months from the date of receipt of the said order.

3. It is stated at the Bar that a copy of the order, dated 06.03.2024, was submitted by the petitioner before the respondent authority on 28.03.2025, requesting for appointment, as directed in the above-noted writ petition. However, despite receipt of the copy of this Court's order, dated 06.03.2025, according to the petitioner, the respondent authorities did not issue appointment order to him.

4. In this regard, the petitioner has also issued reminders to the authority concerned. However, the respondent authority did not issue any appointment order in favour of the petitioner even after expiry of more than 2(two) months resulting in filing of this contempt petition.

5. The respondent No. 2 by filing an affidavit-in-opposition in the meantime, has stated that on receipt of the directions for consideration of the case of the petitioner, it is seen from the record that the petitioner's name is placed at Serial No. 8 of the waiting list being maintained by the Department; and his case could only be considered after 7(seven) applicants senior to him, are appointed subject to availability of the vacancies. It is further contended that the Department as well as the Directorate were concerned about the case of the petitioner, herein. However, the case of the petitioner could not be considered as he is at Serial No. 8 of the waiting list.

Under the above facts and circumstances; he respondent authorities, therefore, undertakes to consider the case of the petitioner as and when his turn comes subject to final decision of the Government.

6. In view of the above contentions made by the respondent, and also taking into consideration the fact that the respondent authorities have undertaken to consider the case of the petitioner as and when his turn comes, this Court is of the view that there is no point in keeping this contempt petition pending any further as it appears that the respondents have substantially complied with this Court's order, dated 06.03.2025, passed in WP(c)298(K)2024 and in this connection, has also undertaken to consider the case of the petitioner as and when his turn comes.

7. Accordingly, the instant contempt petition stands disposed of with a direction to the respondent authorities to consider the case of the petitioner as and when his turn comes in terms of the waiting list, dated 04.10.2025(Annexure C to the affidavit-in-opposition).

Sd/-

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant