GAHC040018882024 2026:GAU-AP:1047-DB

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

Case No. : WA/36/2024

Tadang Tamut and 12 Ors
Son of Shri Talom Tamut, Village Jomlo Mongku, PO Pessing, PS Rumgong, Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh.

2: Tarung Nyising
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Taka Nyising
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

3: Tabom Talom
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Takir Talom
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

4: Tabir Mize
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Taker Mize
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

5: Takar Darung
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Tama Darung
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

6: Laki Mibang
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Tamer Mibang
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

7: Tare Talom
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Tarung Talom
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

8: Tabang Yosung
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Tanyong Yosung
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

9: Samuel Ketan
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Tator Ketan
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District

Arunachal Pradesh.

10: Tapun Gao
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Tangir Gao
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

11: Tapang Tali
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Taja Tali
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

12: Tagam Ketan
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Tabuk Ketan
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh.

13: Tanyi Tali
Age:
Occupation :
Son of Shri Takut Tali
Village Jomlo Mongku
PO Pessing
PS Rumgong
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh

VERSUS

Kaling Saro and 7 Ors
Son of Late Tanon Saro, permanent resident of Village Jomlo Mongku, PO and PS Rumgong, Siang District, Arunachal Pradesh

2:The State of Arunachal Pradesh
Age: 0
Occupation :
represented through the Chief Secretary
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

3:The Secretary Land Management
Age: 0
Occupation :
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

4:The Secretary
Age: 0
Occupation :
Health and Family Welfare
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Itanagar.

5:The Director Health and Family Welfare
Age: 0
Occupation :
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
Naharlagun.

6:The Deputy Commissioner
Age: 0
Occupation :
Siang District
Pangin
Arunachal Pradesh.

7:The District Medical Officer
Age: 0
Occupation :
Siang District
Pangin
Govt of Arunachal Pradesh.

8:The Circle Officer
Age: 0
Occupation :
Jomlo Monbuk
Siang District
Arunachal Pradesh

Advocate for the Petitioner : Lissing Perme, T Tamut,Signal Yirang,Tabung Nonang,A

Perme,Krishna Dubey,K Posi

Advocate for the Respondent : GA (AP), Karmu Chotton,Nani Kuru,Honi Tana Tara,Oken Duggong,Nikita Danggen,SC(Health),Taba Tagum

:::BEFORE:::

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BUDI HABUNG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. UNNI KRISHNAN NAIR

For the Appellants : Mr. L. Perme, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Ms. Nikita Danggen, Advocate;
Ms. P. Pangu, Advocate;
Mr. T. Tagum,
Advocate.

Date on which Judgment is reserved : 11.08.2026

Date of pronouncement of Judgment : **07.10.2026**

Whether the pronouncement is of the

operative part of the Judgment? : NA

Whether the full Judgment has been

pronounced? : Yes

Judgment & Order (CAV)

[N. Unni Krishnan Nair, J)

Heard Mr. L. Perme, learned counsel, appearing for the appellants.

Also heard Ms. Nikita Danggen, learned counsel, appearing for the Respondent No.1; Ms. P. Pangu, learned Government Advocate, representing the State Respondent Nos.2, 3, 6 and 8; and Mr. T. Tagum, learned Standing Counsel, Health Department, appearing for the Respondent Nos.4, 5 and 7.

2. The appellants in the present writ appeal have presented a challenge to a Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024, passed by the learned Single Judge in WP(C).No.53 (AP)/2018.

3. The facts leading to the institution of the writ petition being WP(C).No.53 (AP)/2018, in brief, is noticed, as under;

3.1. The respondent no.1, herein, claims to be the absolute owner of a plot of land measuring 500 sq.mtr., situated at Patum (Domong) at Jomlo Monku village, which was given to the Department of Health Services, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, for establishment of a temporary Primary Health Sub-Centre by his father. It is projected that the said Sub-Centre was established, therein. It is projected that earlier in the year 1994, one Taling Jonnam, had encroached upon the said land inspite of objections raised by the father of the respondent no.1. The objections raised by the father of the respondent no.1, was directed by the jurisdictional authorities to be decided by holding a kebang. Accordingly, it is projected that a kebang was held on 03.06.1997, wherein, the father of the respondent no.1 and the said Taling

Jonnam, had participated. The respondent no.1, had also projected that the title of the land was decided by the kebang in favour of the father of the respondent no.1. Thereafter, the father of the respondent no.1, had approached the Director of Health Services, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, requesting the latter to stop repairing the Sub- Centre, which was constructed over the plot of land, claimed by the father of the respondent no.1.

3.2. It was further projected by the respondent no.1, that the land upon which the temporary Primary Health Sub-Centre was constructed was not acquired by the Government nor it was donated by his father or the respondent no.1. It is also projected that the prayer made by the petitioner for appointment of his wife in lieu of compensation was also not favourably considered by the Director of Health Services, Government of Arunachal Pradesh. The respondent no.1, further projects that as the respondent authorities had not taken any steps for considering his representation, and there being a move to construct a permanent structure over the plot of land, contended to be his land, a complaint was filed before the jurisdictional Deputy Commissioner. However, the Circle Officer, to whom the said complaint was forwarded, rejected the same vide an order dated 04.08.2017, holding that the land was donated to the Director of Health Services, for

setting up of Public Health Centre.

3.3. Being aggrieved by the above developments, the respondent no.1, had approached the Writ Court by way of instituting a writ petition being WP(C).No.53(AP)/2018.

4. The Writ Court vide Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024, proceeded to dispose of the said writ petition by considering the issues arising, therein, directing the respondent authorities, to acquire the land, in question, and pay compensation to the petitioner in accordance with law, and it was also provided that, in the event, the land is not required by the State, to revert the same back the respondent no.1.

5. Being aggrieved by the said decision, the villagers of Jomlo Monku village, through the appellants, have instituted the present writ appeal, assailing the order dated 05.09.2024, by contending that the land, in question, was a community land and the community had donated the land to the Director of Health Services, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, for setting up of the Public Health Centre, for the welfare of the people of the area. It is also contended that the Kebang decisions would go to establish that the land, in question, was never owned by the respondent no.1 and/or his family.

6. Mr. L. Perme, learned counsel, appearing for the appellants, by reiterating the facts, noticed, hereinabove, has submitted that the

respondent no.1, herein, was an encroacher of the plot of land and staked a claim of being the owner of the land only in the year 2003. It is submitted that earlier on a similar projection made by the father of the respondent no.1, a Kebang was convened and therein, it was decided that in case, in future, people who are residing in Domong area leave the place, then no one shall have the right to come in Patum (Domong) area, and the father of the respondent no.1, shall claim that area by himself.

6.1. Mr. L. Perme, learned counsel, has further submitted that a further Kebang was convened on 07.03.2004, and in the decision of the Kebang, it was recorded that the plot of land, in question, was donated by the community of Jomlo Monku village, for setting up of a Medical Complex. It was further decided that no private person shall be allowed to construct any house or use the land for any other purpose as it belongs to the community and was donated for setting up of a Medical Complex. Mr. Perme, submits that in both the said Kebangs i.e. the Kebang dated 03.06.1997 and 07.03.2004, the father of the respondent no.1 was a participant.

6.2. Mr. Perme, submits that the State Respondents in the affidavit filed by them before the writ Court, had brought on record the said materials, and it was contended that the said plot of land belongs to the community and neither to the father of the respondent no.1 nor the respondent no.1,

himself, can claim the plot of land, in question. Mr. Perme, submits that although the said materials were brought on record which had disputed the claim of the respondent no.1, before the Writ Court, the Writ Court, had proceeded to hold that the plot of land, in question, belonged to the respondent no.1 and passed consequential directions to the State authorities for acquiring the said land and/or for returning the land to the respondent no.1.

6.3. Mr. Perme, submits that the learned Single Judge, had not appreciated the facts coming on record in the writ proceedings with regard to the ownership of the land, in question, and had passed directions to the Government to acquire the land, in question, and/or to revert the land, which was clearly not permissible in view of the Kebang decisions brought on record both by the respondent no.1, herein, as well as the State Respondents. He submits that the Writ Court had also drawn a conclusions to the effect that *stricto sensu,* it cannot be said that the land in question, was donated by the father of the respondent no.1, for establishment of the Primary Health Sub-Center, but was allowed to be used temporarily.

6.4. Mr. Perme, submits that decision of the Kebang convened on 03.06.1997, would go to clearly establish that the same had not declared the title of the father of the respondent no.1, over the plot of land, in question,

and had only provided that in future, in the event, persons residing in the Patum (Domong) area moves out of the area, and the hospital is shifted therefrom, then only the father of the respondent no.1, can claim the area by himself. Mr. Perme, submits that the said Kebang decision, has not been assailed by the father of the respondent no.1 and/or the respondent no.1, and accordingly, the same has attained it finality. Mr. Perme, submits that no decision contrary to the Kebang decision dated 03.06.1997, would be permissible to be taken, inasmuch as, the Health Complex over the plot of land, in question, still continues to function, therefrom.

6.5. Mr. Perme, further submits that although materials had come on record which had indicated that the land, in question, was donated by the community, no effort was made by the respondent no.1 to implead the villagers of Jomlo Monku village, as party respondents in writ petition instituted by him and the villagers through the present appellants, have approached this Court by instituting the present appeal, only after coming to learn of the directions passed by the Writ Court vide the Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024.

6.6. In the above view of the matter Mr. Perme, submits that the impugned Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024, would mandate an interference from this Court.

7. Ms. Nikita Danggen, learned counsel, appearing for the respondent no.1, has submitted that from the materials coming on record, the title of the father of the respondent no.1, over the plot of land, in question, cannot be disputed. She submits that the plot of land was donated by the father of the respondent no.1, for the purpose of setting up of a temporary Primary Health Sub-Centre and the land was never acquired by the respondent authorities. Accordingly, she submits that the respondent no.1, cannot be deprived of his property, without following the due process of law. She further submits that the respondent authorities being a welfare state cannot also claim adverse possession over the property of a citizen.

7.1. Ms. Danggen, by taking us through the conclusions drawn by the Writ Court in the Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024, has submitted that the conclusions so drawn are reasonable and are based on materials coming on record in the writ proceedings and accordingly, the same would not mandate any interference from this Court.

8. Mr. T. Tagum, learned Standing Counsel, Health Department, appearing for the Respondent Nos.4, 5 and 7, at the outset had denied the claim made by the respondent no.1, in the writ petition and has reiterated that the plot of land, in question, was donated by the villagers of Jomlo Monku village, way back in the year 1988.

8.1. Mr. Tagum, by referring to the decision of the Kebang, dated 07.03.2004, has submitted that a perusal of the same would reveal that the land, in question, was donated not by the father of the respondent no.1 but by the villagers of Jomlo Monku village, for setting up of a Medical Complex, thereon. He submits that the said Kebang decision arrived at dated 03.06.1997, in absence of a challenge being made, thereto, by the respondent no.1, herein, had attained its finality and no claim contrary thereto, would be permissible to be raised by the respondent no.1.

8.2. Mr. T. Tagum, has submitted that infact it is the father of the respondent no.1, who was a encroacher of the land, in question, and after having encroached the land, had raised claim of being the absolute owner of the plot of land, in question, and the said claim was followed up by the respondent no.1, herein. Mr. Tagum, submits that the jurisdictional Circle Officer, in pursuance to a complaint raised in the matter by the father of the respondent no.1, over illegal constructions of permanent structure, over his land, by one Tapir Tamut, had basing on the materials coming on record, held that in view of the Kebang decision holding the field, the father of the respondent no.1, would have no claim of the land donated for setting up of the Public Health Sub-Center, but in the event, the Public Health Sub-Center, shifts from the present location, at Domong, then the father of the

respondent no.1 can claim his land.

8.3. Mr. T. Tagum, has submitted that the order dated 04.08.2017, has the effect of reiterating the decision arrived at by the Kebang in its meeting held on 03.06.1997. Mr. Tagum, further submits that the father of the respondent no.1, was a party to the Kebang decisions and accordingly, the land being donated there is no question of acquiring the same on payment of compensation. Mr. Tagum, has further submitted that the plea raised by the respondent no.1, to the effect that the land was donated only for the purpose of setting up of a temporary Primary Health Sub-Centre, is not supported by the materials coming on record and is clearly contrary to the decisions arrived at by the Kebang in its meeting held on 03.06.1997.

8.4. In the above premises, Mr. T. Tagum, submits that the impugned Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024, would mandate an interference by this Court.

9. Ms. P. Pangu, learned Government Advocate, representing the State Respondent Nos.2, 3, 6 and 8, has submitted that she would adopt the arguments advanced by Mr. T. Tagum, learned Standing Counsel, Department of Health Services, Government of Arunachal Pradesh.

10. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and also perused the materials available on record.

11. From the materials brought on record, this Court finds that the villagers of Jomlo Monku village, have claimed that the land in question, was donated by them for setting up of a Primary Health Sub-Centre, while it the projection of the respondent no.1, that the father of the respondent no.1, was the absolute owner of the land, in question, and had parted with the same for setting up of a Primary Health Sub-Centre, temporarily, thereon.

12. To appreciate the said contention, we have perused the Kebang decision dated 03.06.1997. On a perusal of the said decision, we find that although the dispute involved was between the father of the respondent no.1 and one Taling Jonnam, the Kebang had decided that Taling Jonnam, shall not create any disturbance on Patum (Domong) area and further, in case, in future people who are residing in (Domong) area, leaves the place, and/or the hospital is shifted out from the plot of land, wherein, it is so standing, no one shall have the right to claim to the area and the father of the respondent no.1, shall only claim the area by himself. The said projections goes to reveal that the Public Health Sub Centre was not ever considered to be set up temporarily but was set up, therein, for the welfare of the people of the area. The said Kebang decision dated 03.06.1997, was not assailed by the father of the respondent no.1 or the respondent no.1 himself, at any point and the same has accordingly, attained it finality.

13. The parties to the proceedings have submitted that the Primary Health Sub-Centre, continues to function even as on date over the plot of land, which is claimed by the respondent no.1, herein. Accordingly, the said Medical Complex continuing to function from the plot of land, in question, in terms of the Kebang decision dated 03.06.1997, neither the father of the respondent no.1 nor the respondent no.1, himself can claim the said plot of land. The right of the respondent no.1, to claim the plot of land would arise only after the villagers of Domong area leave the place and/or the Medical Complex is shifted out, therefrom. The said Kebang decision is further reiterated in decision arrived at by the Kebang in its meeting held on 07.03.2004, wherein, it was also recorded that the plot of land, in question, was donated by the community of Jomlo Monku village for setting up of a Medical Complex. The father of the respondent no.1 is found to be a signatory in both the Kebang decisions of 03.06.1997 and 07.03.2004. However, the decisions arrived, therein, has not been assailed either by the father of the respondent no.1 nor the respondent no.1, herein.

14. Having noticed the above position, this Court would now examine the conclusions drawn by the Writ Court vide the Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024. The Writ Court upon examining the matter had drawn the following conclusions;

"*11. It is not disputed that the land originally belongs to the father of the petitioner, which was allowed to be used for establishment of Primary Health Sub Centre. By various Kebang decisions, it appears that the land in question shall be utilized for the purpose of establishment of Primary Health Sub Centre, which is being utilized as on date.*

12. It appears that the father of the petitioner has filed a complaint before the Health Services, in the year 2000 claiming back the land, on the ground that he has already developed the land for horticulture garden and to not repair the structure of the Primary Health Sub-Centre. The petitioner, thereafter, on various occasions, has approached the respondent authorities for appointment of his wife in government service in lieu of compensation for the land in question or to acquire the land and to pay the compensation to the petitioner as the ownership of the land is not disputed.

13. On careful consideration of the Kebang decisions (supra), it is seen that the land in question belongs to the father of the petitioner and same was given to the Health Department for establishment of Primary Health Sub Centre for the people of Jomlo Mobuk circle. In 2(two) out of 3(three) Kebang decisions, the father of the petitioner had participated, which Indicates his agreement to the decisions of the Kebang. In stricto sensu, it cannot be said that the land in question was donated by the father of the petitioner for establishment-of Primary Health Sub Centre but was allowed to be used temporarily. An act of participation and subscribing to the Kebang Decisions may lead to presumption of donation but such presumption cannot be ground for depriving the person of his property.

14. Ordinarily, since the father of the petitioner has participated and subscribed to the Kebang decisions, the claim for compensation of the land in question or to return it to the petitioner may not be appropriate to accept as the father of the petitioner has given the

land to be utilized for the purpose of establishment of Primary Health Sub Centre which is for the interest of the people of the area at large. However, since the father of the petitioner had made a complaint not to repair the structure of the Primary Health Sub Centre, on the ground that he has developed the area for horticultural purpose and the petitioner to approach the respondent authorities claiming compensation including seeking appointment of his wife in lieu of compensation or to revert back the land, no document is produced disclosing donation of the land legally and when the title and ownership is not disputed, I am of the considered view that petitioner cannot be deprived of his property without due process of law which would entail infringement of right to property.

15. In the case of Vidya Devi (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the constitutional right under Article 300A which provides that no person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of or procedure established by law. It has held that to forcibly dispossess a person of his private property, without following the due process of law, would be violative of human right and also the constitutional right under Article 300-A of the constitution. In a democratic polity governed by rule of law, the State could not have deprived a citizen of their property without the sanction of law. The State being a welfare State governed by rule of law cannot arrogate to itself a status beyond what is provided by the constitution.

16. Although, facts of the case in Vidya Devi (Supra), is different from the present case, the proposition of law would be applicable. In that case, the authority has taken over the land without due process of law and a plea was taken by the State that since it has been in continuous possession of the land for over 42 years, it would tantamount to adverse possession. In that context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that it is surprised by the plea taken by the State before the High Court, that since it has been in continuous

possession of land for over 42 years, it would tantamount to adverse possession. The being a welfare State, cannot be permitted to take the plea of adverse possession, which allows a trespasser i.e. a person guilty of a tort, or even a crime, to gain legal title over such property for over 12 years. The State cannot be permitted to perfect its title over the land by invoking the doctrine of adverse possession to grab the property of its own citizens.

17. In the present case, though the father of the petitioner has allowed temporarily the land for establishment of Primary Health Sub Centre at Patum (Domong), Jomlo Mongku village, which is for the interest of the people in his area, there is nothing on record to show that same was transferred absolutely in favour of the Department except the plea of donation sought to be derived from the Kebang decisions. No doubt, the land was allowed to be utilized but on temporary basis. The father of the petitioner filed an objection not to further repair the structure of Health Sub Centre and thereafter, the petitioner has approached the authorities for compensation either in the form of appointment of his wife in the Govt. service or to pay land compensation or to return the land to the petitioner. There is no dispute to the title and ownership of the petitioner over the land in question.

18. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the present case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner has been deprived of his property. Thus, I am of the view that the petitioner is entitled to compensation of the land as the land of the petitioner has neither been acquired by following due process of law nor transferred by way of donation in accordance with law.

19. In view of the above, the respondent authorities are directed to acquire the land in question and pay compensation to petitioner in accordance with law, if the land in question is required by the State, and/ or to revert back the land to the petitioner. The exercise as directed hereinabove shall be done within a period not later than 3 (three) months from the

receipt of the copy of this order."

15. A perusal of the conclusions drawn by the learned Writ Court would go to reveal that in paragraph-13 of its decision, the Writ Court had held that the participation of the father of the respondent no.1, herein, in 2 (two) out of 3 (three) Kebangs involved, to indicate the acceptance of the decisions of the Kebangs by him. It was further concluded that, it cannot be said that the land, in question, was donated by the father of the respondent no.1, for establishment of the Primary Health Sub-Centre, but was allowed to be used temporarily.

16. In paragraph-14 of its decision, the Writ Court had further recorded that since the father of the respondent no.1, had participated and subscribed to the Kebang decisions, the claim for compensation of the land, in question, or to return to the respondent no.1, may not be appropriate to accept as the father of respondent no.1, had given the land to be utilized for the purpose of establishment of Primary Health Sub-Centre, which is for the interest of the people of the area at large. **17.** However, having drawn the said conclusions, Writ Court proceeded to draw a contrary conclusion to the effect that since the father of the respondent no.1, had made a complaint to the authorities not to repair the structure of the Primary Health Sub-Centre on the ground that, he had developed the area for horti-culture purpose, and

the respondent no.1, herein, having approached the respondent authorities claiming compensation, including seeking appointment of his wife in lieu of compensation and or to revert back the land, no document being produced disclosing donation of the land legally, the title and the ownership of the respondent no.1, over the said plot of land cannot be disputed. The said conclusions in our considered view is clearly perverse, inasmuch as, the same is not supported by the materials brought on record. The said projection is solely based on the projections made by the respondent no.1, in the writ petition. The decision of the Kebang dated 03.06.1997, further fortifies our conclusions, inasmuch as, the father of the respondent no.1, was permitted to claim land in the area only in the event of all the villagers of Domong area had left the place and also the Medical Complex was shifted out, therefrom. Both the situations not having occasioned, the respondent no.1, cannot be held to have any right to claim the plot of land in question. Accordingly, in our considered view, the conclusions drawn by the Writ Court that the respondent no.1 was the absolute owner of the plot of land, in question, is clearly erroneous.

18. The Writ Court having drawn contrary conclusions, in the matter and the conclusions drawn in favour of the respondent no.1, not being found by us to be supported by materials coming on record, a disputed questions of

fact had emerged in the matter, which was not permissible to be so resolved by solely relying upon the materials coming on record in the writ proceedings. The said dispute not being permissible to be resolved without going into the factual controversy, we are of the considered view that the Writ Court should not have entertained the writ petition. Accordingly, after noticing the said disputed position with regard to the ownership of the land in question, the Writ Court ought not to have proceeded further to declare the title of the respondent no.1, over the plot of land and further direct the State Respondents to acquire the land and/or to return the same to the respondent no.1, herein.

19. In view of the above conclusions drawn by us, we find that the conclusions drawn by the Writ Court in its Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024, in WP(C).No.53 (AP)/2018, to be not sustainable and to mandate an interference from this Court.

20. In view of the above discussion, we proceed to set aside the impugned Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024. Having interfered with the Judgment & Order dated 05.09.2024, passed by the Writ Court in WP(C).No.53(AP)/2018, we direct that the possession of the plot of land, in question, shall be continued to be governed by the decision of the Kebang dated 03.06.1997.

21. With the above observations and directions, the present Writ Appeal stands disposed of.

JUDGE **JUDGE**

Comparing Assistant