GAHC040016802026

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

Case No. : WP(C)/493/2026

Smti Gyamar Yapu
Wife of Late Gyamar Tagam, resident of Yupia-I Village, PO and PS Doimukh, Papum Pare District, Arunachal Pradesh.

VERSUS

The State of AP and 6 Ors
represented by the Secretary, Land Management Department, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar. 2:The Director
Age: 0
Occupation :
Land Management Department
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

3:The Deputy Commissioner
Age: 0
Occupation :
Yupia
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh.

4:The DLRSO Yupia
Age: 0
Occupation :
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh.

5:The Sub Divisionla Officer
Age: 0
Occupation :

Yupia
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh.

6:Smti Nabam Yadap
Age: 0
Occupation :
Wife of Late Nabam Anung
resident of Yupia-III Village
PO and PS Doimukh
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh.

7:Smti Nabam Yabang
Age: 0
Occupation :
Wife of Dr K Nishing
resident of near BTM Hospital
Papu Nallah
Naharlagun
PO and PS Naharlagun
Papum Pare District
Arunachal Pradesh

Advocate for the Petitioner : Lissing Perme, Signal Yirang,Natu Niji,Toge Rolley,A Perme,Krishna Dubey,Jumge Riram

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP),

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NELSON SAILO

ORDER

06.10.2026

Heard Mr. L. Perme, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. N. Lowang, learned Senior Government Advocate representing State respondent Nos. 1 to 5.

2. Mr. Perme, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is aggrieved with the issuance of Land Possession

Certificate (for short, 'LPC'), namely, DLRSO/pp/lpc-43/14 dated 28.11.2014 to the respondent No. 6 on the ground that the same has been issued without following the procedure prescribed for issuing such LPC vide Office Memorandum No. LR-31/84 dated 19.12.1988. The learned counsel, therefore, submits that the respondent authorities may be directed to clarify as to whether they have indeed followed the procedure prescribed for issuance of the said LPC.

3. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has, in fact, filed a Title Suit No. 22/2022 by impleading the present respondent Nos. 6 & 7 as defendants in the said suit claiming right, title and interest over the suit land in question. Since the legality and validity of the said LPC is not an issue raised in the Title Suit, the petitioner has, therefore, filed the instant writ petition before this Court.

4. The learned counsel also submits that the petitioner was not aware about the issuance of the said LPC to the respondent concerned until date and therefore, the petitioner have not raised the same before the Civil Court concerned.

5. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner has claimed title over the said plot of land covered by LPC and the title suit is admittedly pending for consideration and disposal and as such, in order to avoid multiplicity of proceedings, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner should pursue the title suit

before the Civil Court concerned. Further, if the petitioner, so wishes, he can very well amend the pleadings in the title suit by filing appropriate application to challenge the issuance of the aforesaid LPC to the respondent concerned. As such, in the event of filing such application, the learned Civil Court should consider the same and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

6. It is ordered accordingly

7. With the above observation and direction, the writ petition stands disposed of, at the motion stage, itself.

JUDGE

CHECKED & VERIFIED

Digitally signed by Talom Tali
Date: 2026.10.06 15:51:42 +05'30'