GAHC010216872025

2026:GAU-AS:15014

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

Case No. : CRP(IO)/407/2025

NATUN SARANIA GANDHIBASTI MANDIR PARICHALAN COMMITTEE REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT, SRI BIKAS BARUA, SON OF LATE JAGAT BARUAH, AGED ABOUT - 67 YEARS, RESIDENT OF HOUSE NO. 35, BYE LANE NO. 2, GANDHIBASTI NEAR KALI MANDIR, P.S. CHANDMARI, IN THE DISTRICT OF KAMRUP M, PIN -781003.

VERSUS

SHRI HEM KANTA CHOUDHURY
SON OF LATE ATUL CHOUDHURY, RESIDENT OF HOUSE NO. 24, BYE LANE NO. 4, NEAR KALI MANDIR, GANDHIBASTI, IN THE DISTRICT OF KAMRUP M, 781003.

2:SHRI SAPUN HAZARIKA
SON OF LATE ANIL HAZARIKA
RESIDENT OF MAMONI RAISOM GOSWAMI PATH
NEAR KALI MANDIR
GANDHIBASTI
IN THE DISTRICT OF KAMRUP M
781003.

3:SHRI BALEN CHOUDHURY
SON OF LATE BHABANI CHOUDHURY
RESIDENT OF HOUSE NO. 22
BYE LANE NO. 4
NEAR KALI MANDIR
GANDHIBASTI
IN THE DISTRICT OF KAMRUP M
781003.

4:SHRI CHAMPAK LAHKAR
SON OF LATE MADAN LAHKAR

HOUSE NO. 23
BYE LANE NO. 4
NEAR KALI MANDIR
GANDHIBASTI
IN THE DISTRICT OF KAMRUP M
781003.

5:SHRI KALYAN KUMAR DUTTA
SON OF LATE ANIL DUTTA
RESIDENT OF BYE LANE NO. 7
NEAR KALI MANDIR
GANDHIBASTI
IN THE DISTRICT OF KAMRUP M
781003

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. B D DEKA, N CHAUDHURY,MR A DEKA,MR A DEKA

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE SUSMITA PHUKAN KHAUND

ORDER

Date : 07-10-2026

Heard learned counsel Mr. B.D. Deka assisted by learned counsel Mr. A. Deka for the petitioner, who has filed this application under Article 227 of the Constitution of India as the petitioner is aggrieved by the non-implementation of the injunction order dated 20.07.2024 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior) Division No. 3, Kamrup (M), Guwahati in connection with Misc. (J) Case No. 343/2024 arising out of T.S. No. 221/2024.

2. An injunction order dated 20.07.2024 was passed by the learned Trial Court, restraining the opposite parties/defendants from convening the biennial meeting of the plaintiff's society on 21.07.2024. Further, the defendants/opposite parties were restrained from holding any meeting without

having sanction and approval of the Parichalana Sammittee of the plaintiff/petitioner and making any financial dealing on behalf of the society. This order was not implemented.

3. As this order was not implemented, this revision petition was preferred by the petitioner and a police report was called by this Court. The police report reveals that some constructions were already erected in the suit premises.

4. I have considered the submissions at the bar.

5. Considering the entire aspect of the matter, the Trial Court is directed to pass necessary orders in connection with Misc (J) Case No. 343/2024 arising out of Title Suit No. 221/2024 for implementation of the injunction order, before the ensuing puja vacation.

6. In terms of the above observation, this petition stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant