GAHC040018682025

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

Case No. : IA(C)/276/2025

Smti Nang Ajingya Namchoom
Wife of Late Chow Kalingko Namchoom, resident of Momong Village, PO and PS Chongkham, Namsai District, Arunachal Pradesh.

VERSUS

The Chief Secretary and 5 Ors
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar 2:The Secretary Transport
Age: 0
Occupation :
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

3:The General Manager
Age: 0
Occupation :
State Transport Service
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Naharlagun.

4:The Station Superintendent
Age: 0
Occupation :
State Transport Service
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Namsai District
Arunachal Pradesh.

5:Krishna Bdr Chetry
Age: 0
Occupation :
Son of Kashi Prasad Chetry
C/o the Station Superintendent

Sate Transport Service
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Namsai District
Arunachal Pradesh.

6:Chow Sambita Namchoom
Age: 0
Occupation :
Son of Late Chow Mangsa Namchoom
Village Momong
PO and PS Chowkham
Namsai District
Arunachal Pradesh

Advocate for the Petitioner : Bolu Ram Das,

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP),

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR SHARMA

ORDER

Date : ***19.11.2026***

Heard Mr. B. R. Das, learned counsel for the applicant. Also heard Ms. P. Sangeeta, learned Junior Government Advocate for the State respondents No.1 to 4.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that respondent No. 5, i.e., the driver of the government vehicle and the respondent No. 6, who is a relative of the deceased, are not necessary parties and, therefore, no notice is required to be issued to them. Accordingly, it is prayed that the names of the aforesaid two respondents may be struck off.

3. In view of the aforesaid submission, the names of the respondent Nos. 5 and 6 are struck off from present application.

4. This interlocutory application has been preferred seeking condonation of

delay of 72 days in preferring the connected MAC appeal.

5. It is submitted that out of the aforesaid delay of 72 days, 33 days were required for obtaining certified copies of the impugned judgment and order. As far as the remaining delay, the same has been explained in paragraphs 6 to 23 of the instant application, which I have perused.

6. Learned Government Advocate submits that the respondents have no objection to the condonation of delay of 72 days.

7. Having regard to the above as well as the grounds shown in the application, I am of the considered view that the applicant was prevented by sufficient cause from preferring the connected appeal within the period of limitation prescribed by law.

8. Accordingly, the delay of 72 days in preferring the connected appeal stands condoned. The interlocutory application stands allowed and disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant