GAHC040014832026

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

Case No. : WP(C)/426/2026

Tapak Mra
Son of Shri Tagu Mra, Village Ging, Limeking Circle, PO and PS Nacho, Upper Subansiri District, Arunachal Pradesh.

VERSUS

The State of AP and 6 Ors
represented by Secretary, Department of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar. 2:The Principal Chief Conservator of Forest and Head of Forest Force
Age: 0
Occupation :
Department of Environment
Forest and Climate Change
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

3:The Additinal Principal Chief Conservator of Forest
Age: 0
Occupation :
(Working Plan and Information Technology)
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

4:The Conservator of Forest
Age: 0
Occupation :
Northern Working Plan
Van Vihar
Itanagar
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

5:The Divisionla Forest Officer

Age: 0
Occupation :
Social Forest Division
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

6:The Range Forest Officer
Age: 0
Occupation :
Northern Working Plan
Range-I
Van Vihar
Chimpu
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

7:The Range in Charge
Age: 0
Occupation :
northern Working Plan
Range- I and II
Northern Working Plan
Chimpu
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar

Advocate for the Petitioner : Kago Taja, Kirmar Ado,L Koyu

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP),

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MEDHI

ORDER

Date : 09.09.2026

Heard Shri K. Taja, learned for the petitioner. Also heard Shri D. Kamduk, learned Additional Advocate General for the State of Arunachal Pradesh.

Considering the subject matter involved, this writ petition is taken up for disposal at the motion stage itself.

The challenge in this writ petition is against the action of the respondents directing the petitioner to vacate the quarter occupied by the petitioner.

As per the facts projected, the petitioner, who is working as a Range Forest Officer (RFO), was transferred from Chimpu, Itanagar, to Kurung Kumey. Pursuant to such transfer, he was released on 02.01.2025.

Shri K. Taja, learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that he has a school-going child studying in Class XII, who would be appearing in the Board examination, and also a child having autism undergoing therapy. Accordingly the quarter allocated to him at Chimpu was retained. However, without considering the aforesaid aspects, the impugned notice dated 21.08.2026 was issued, followed by another notice dated 24.08.2026.

The learned counsel has submitted that there has been deduction on account of occupying the quarter at Chimpu, and that he has not taken any government accommodation at Kurung Kumey. He has also contended that though he was released on 02.01.2025, he was still holding the charge till July 2026.

Per contra, Shri Kamduk, the learned Additional Advocate General has submitted that the transfer order, being dated 17.12.2024, was followed by the petitioner being released on 02.01.2025. The petitioner has already been accommodated for a considerable period of one year and six months, taking into consideration the hardships projected by the petitioner. However, the petitioner is required to arrange for alternative accommodation, for which a period of one year and six months is more

than enough.

This Court is of the considered opinion that, though the petitioner may have hardships, since the transfer order is dated 17.12.2024 and he was released on 02.01.2025, the action of the respondent authorities in issuing the orders dated 21.08.2026 and 24.08.2026 cannot be faulted with.

This Court is of the opinion that it finds force in the submission advanced by the learned Additional Advocate General that a period of one year and six months is a reasonable period to enable the petitioner to arrange for alternative accommodation, even in case there are personal hardships.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition to interfere. However, in the interest of justice, it is directed that the impugned orders dated 21.08.2026 and 24.08.2026 be kept in abeyance for a further period of 45 days, which shall expire on 28.10.2026.

In the event the petitioner does not vacate the premises within the time stipulated, the authorities would be at liberty to take action in accordance with law.

JUDGE

CHECKED & VERIFIED

Digitally signed by HAGE MEENA
Date: 2026.09.09 17:14:06 +05'30'