

GAHC010129002026



DB

2026:GAU-AS:9246-

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

Case No. : WA/211/2026

ABDUL KHALEK AND 66 ORS.
S/O-ABDUL BAREKA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL, P.O.-
MERAPANI, P.S-MERAPANI, DIST.- GOLAGHAT, ASSAM

2: ABDUL HASEN
S/O.-LT. ABDUL SALAM A RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

3: ABDUL MOTLIB
S/O-LT. ABDUL SALAMA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

4: SAMSUL ALI
S/O- SAHABUDDINA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

5: ABUL HUSSAIN
S/O- SAMSUL ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

6: ABDUL ROHIM

S/O-NEGBOR ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

7: NABI HUSSAIN

S/O- LT. AMJED ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

8: JOYNUDDIN

S/O- LT. SARMAMUDA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

9: JOYNAL ABEDIN

S/O- LT. JABDUL SEKHA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

10: ABDUL HAMID

S/O- LT. AHMOD ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

11: MIRU HUSSAIN

S/O- LT. AMJAT ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

12: NURUL ISLAM

S/O- LT. AHMAD ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

13: ABDUL MOTLIB

LT. SAHAMAT ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

14: ABDUL SATTAR

S/O- SAHAMAT ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

15: MOJIBUR RAHMAN

S/O- LATE SAMAD ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

16: HOBIBUR RAHMAN

S/O- LATE SAMAD ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

17: AJIBUR RAHMAN

S/O-LATE SAMAD ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

18: SAHAD ALI

S/O- ISMAIL ALI ALIAS ISMAILEA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2

NEGHERIBILLP.O.- MERAPANI

P.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

19: ABDUL KADIR

S/O- SABEDA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILLP.O.- MERAPANI

P.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

20: JAHAD ALI

S/O- ISMAIL ALI ALIAS ISMAMILEA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2

NEGHERIBILL P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

21: YAKUB ALI

S/O- ABDUL JABBERA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

22: ABDUL RAJAK

S/O- AMJAT ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI

DIST.- GOLAGHAT

ASSAM

23: YUSUF ALI

S/O- LATE LUKMAN ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

24: ALLAL UDDIN

S/O- ABDUL ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

25: MAINUL HAQUE

S/O-LATE ILAHI BAKHSA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

26: ISRAFIL ALI

S/O-LT. JALAL UDDINA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

27: ABDUL JALIL

S/O-IBRAHIM ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

28: ABDUL JABBER

S/O- LT. MEJACHIN SHEIKHA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

29: ABDUL MAJID

S/O- LT. ALIMUDDIN MAJIDA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

30: RAHIM UDDIN

S/O-LT. AMJAT ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

31: AMIR HUSSAIN
S/O- LT. MOHAJAN HUSSAINA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

32: SAMAR UDDIN AHMED
S/O-JAYNAL ABEDINA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

33: ROFIZ UDDIN
S/O- LT. MIRAJ ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

34: MUSTAFA ALI

S/O-LT. SULEMAN ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

35: ABUL BASAR
S/O- LT. SAFIQU L ISLAMA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

36: RAFIQU L ISLAM
S/O-LT. IDRISH ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

37: ABUSAMA ALI
S/O- LT. RUSTAM ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

38: ANARUL HUSSAIN
S/O-LT. MOJIBUR RAHMANA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

39: ABDUL SALAM

S/O- LT. AMCHAR ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

40: ABDUL KADIR
S/O- AHMAD ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

41: HASEN KAZI
S/O- LT. PACHAN ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

42: IKRAJUL HAQUE
S/O-LT. OMAR KAJIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

43: HABIBUR RAHMAN
S/O- LATE CHAMAR ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

44: FURKAN ALI
S/O-KAJIMUDDIN ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

45: MAJIBUR RAHMAN
S/O- LT. CHAMAR ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

46: NUR HUSSAIN
S/O- OCHAMAN ALI ALIAS OSMAN ALI A RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2
NEGHERIBILLP.O.- MERAPANI
P.S-MERAPANIDIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

47: ABBACH ALI ALIAS ABBAS ALI
S/O- LT. HACHEN ALI ALIAS HASEN ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2
NEGHERIBILL

P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

48: ABDUL JABBER
S/O- JOYNAL ABEDINA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

49: ABDUL BAREK
S/O- LT. JUBED ALI.A RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

50: RAHAM ALI

/O-LT. AMCHAR ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

51: YUSUF ALI
S/O- LT. NEKABAR ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

52: MAMUD ALI
S/O-LT. ISMAIL ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

53: FAKR UDDIN
S/O.- LATE JAHUR UDDIN A RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

54: MAINUL HAQUE
S/O.- SAIDUR RAHMAN A RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

55: ABDUL ALI

S/O.- SAHAB UDDIN A RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM.

56: SAIDUL RAHMAN
S/O.- LATE HUSSAIN ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

57: AJAN ALI
S/O.- JAYMAT ALIA RESIDENT OF VILL -NO. 2 NEGHERIBILL
P.O.- MERAPANIP.S-MERAPANI
DIST.- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

58: ABDUS SALAM
S/O- ABDUL HAMID.AGE- 45 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN.DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

59: FAIJUL HOQUE
S/O- JALAL UDDIN.AGE- 32 YEARSVILL- RAJAPUKHURI
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM.

60: JAKIR HUSSAIN
S/O- KARI ISMAIL.AGE- 36 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

61: HARIS ALI
S/O- CHAMAR ALIAS SAMAR ALI.AGE- 31YEARSVILL- GELAJAN.DIST-
GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

62: SAMSUL HAQUE
S/O- ROMJAN ALI.AGE- 59 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

63: KAPIL UDDIN
S/O- CHABU SHAIKH.AGE- 57 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

64: ABUL HACHIM
S/O- HABIJ UDDIN.AGE- 79 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN

DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM.

65: ABUL HUSSAIN
S/O- MOIJUDDIN.AGE- 42 YEARSVILL- RAJAPUKHURI
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

66: AHMED ALI
S/O- UMED ALLI.AGE- 65 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

67: JAFAR ALI
S/O- MAJIT ULLAH.AGE- 70 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

68: ABDUL MALIK
S/O-PIJARU MALIK.AGE- 66 YEARSVILL- GELAJAN
DIST- GOLAGHAT
ASSA

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 10 ORS.
TO BE REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF ASSAM, JANATA BHAWAN ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX, DISPUR,
GUWAHATI- 781006

2:SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT
JANATA BHAWAN
ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

3:COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
JANATA BHAWAN
ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

4:PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS AND HEAD OF FOREST
FORCE AND WILDLIFE
O/O THE PCCF HOFF
ASSAM

ARANYA BHAWAN
PANJABARI
GUWAHATI- 781037

5:DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER
GOLAGHAT DIVISION
GOLAGHAT
ASSAM.

6:DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

7:SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
GOLAGHAT
ASSAM

8:CIRCLE OFFICER
SARUPATHAR REVENUE CIRCLE
GOLAGHAT
ASSAM.

9:CIRCLE OFFICER
GOLAGHAT REVENUE CIRCLE
GOLAGHAT
ASSAM.

10:OFFICER IN CHARGE
URIAMGHAT POLICE STATION
GOLAGHAT
ASSAM.

11:OFFICER IN CHARGE
MERAPANI POLICE STATION
GOLAGHAT
ASSA

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. A R BHUYAN, S LASKAR,MS. R YASMIN,MR N A MAZARBHUIYA,MR. M A I HUSSAIN

Advocate for the Respondent : GA, ASSAM, SC, REVENUE,SC, FOREST

MIR HUSSAIN AND 51 ORS.
S/O LT. JABED ULLAH AGE 50 YEARS VILLAGE JAMUNA MOUDANGA
KRISHIPAM NIGAM
DISTRICT-NAGAON
ASSAM

2: MOKTER ALI
S/O - MAYARUF ALI
VILLAGE - PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT - NAGAON
ASSAM

3: MD JAINAL ABDIN
S/O - ABDUL KHALIK
VILLAGE - PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT - NAGAON
ASSAM

4: ABDUL LATIB
S/O - HARAFAN ALI IRFAN ALI VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

5: ABDUL HEKIM
S/O - LT TAJMUL ALI
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

6: ANWARA BEGUM
D/O KUTUB ALI
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

7: AKLIMA KHATUN
W/O - ABDUL HEKIM
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

8: SAMIRUN NESSA
D/O - NAZIM UDDIN VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

9: AZIR UDDIN
S/O - ABDUL HEKIM VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

10: JABEDA KHATUN
W/O - ABDUR RAHIM
VILLAGE SADAR GAON DISTRICT NAGAON

ASSAM

11: SHARIF UDDIN
S/O ABDUL KHALIK
VILLAGE KAROIGURI DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

12: MUHIBUR RAHMAN
S/O INTAJ ALI
VILLAGE HATIKHALI DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

13: FAYAJ ALI
S/O RASID ALI
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

14: JAHANARA BEGUM
D/O - TUWAKUL ALI
VILLAGE JAMUNA MOUDANGA KRISHIPAM NIGAM DISTRICT HOJAI
ASSAM

15: KULSUMA BEGUM
W/O - ABDUL HANNAN
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

16: RAHMAN ALI
S/O SIRAJ UDDIN
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

17: ALFATUN NESSA
W/O MASADDAR ALI
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

18: ABDUL MALIK
S/O ISMAIL ALI
VILLAGE AMBARI DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

19: ISLAM UDDIN
C/O ABDUL HASIM
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT HOJAI
ASSAM

20: ABDUL KUDDUS

S/O ISMAIL ALI
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

21: MOINUL HAQUE
S/O LT. ARAPIJ ALI
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

22: GIYAS UDDIN
S/O HUSSAIN AHMED
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

23: JALAL UDDIN
S/O ABDUL RAHIM
VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

24: JAMIR UDDIN
S/O MAJAHID ALI AGE 51 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

25: ALI HUSSAIN
S/O JALAL UDDIN AGE 27 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

26: CHAMPA BEGUM
W/O LATU MIYAN AGE 56 YEARS VILLAGE PASCHIM MOUDANGA
KRISHIPAM DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

27: ALA UDDIN
S/O LT YUSUF ALI AGE 41 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

28: ABDUL MANNAN
S/O LT. IDRISH ALI AGE 55 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

29: BADAR UDDIN
S/O ABDUL MANNAN
AGE 30 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

30: ABDUL HASIM
S/O SAFAR ALI AGE 68 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

31: ABDUL ROUF
S/O MUKSED ALI AGE 68 YEARS VILLAGE DAKHIN BHEDEOATI DISTRICT
HOJAI
ASSAM

32: MOIN UDDIN
S/O MAKASHED ALI AGE 67 YEARS VILLAGE JAMUNA MOUDANGA
KRISHIPAM NIGAM DISTRICT HOJAI
ASSAM

33: AMIR UDDIN
S/O LT. FACHANDRA ALI AGE 53 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON
DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

34: MAHAMMAD ABDULLA
S/O ABDUL KARIM AGE 50 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

35: SIABUR RAHMAN
S/O ATAUR RAHMAN AGE 19 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON
DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

36: ABDUL JALIL
S/O BASIR ALI AGE 52 YEARS VILLAGE JAMUNA MOUDANGA KRISHIPAM
NIGAM DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

37: JAKIR HUSSAIN
S/O ALIM UDDIN AGE 20 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

38: 38 MAIJUL HAQUE
S/O ABBAS ALI AGE 44 YEARS VILLAGE SHINGGARI DISTRICT NOWGAON
ASSAM

39: MUSLIMA BEGUM
D/O TUWAKUL ALI AGE 40 YEARS VILLAGE JAMUNA MOUDANGA
KRISHIPAM NIGAM DISTRICT HOJAI

ASSAM

40: MOINUL ISLAM
S/O JAFAR ALI AGE 38 YEARS VILLAGE PACHIM BAGARI DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

41: JAFAR ALI
S/O SULTAN ALI AGE 83 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

42: ALI HUSSAIN
S/O ICHAHAK ALI AGE 33 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

43: SHARIF UDDIN
S/O ABDUL KARIM AGE 27 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

44: JAMIR UDDIN
S/O LT. SIRAJ UDDIN AGE 50 YEARS VILLAGE JAMUNA MOUDANGA
KRISHIPAM NIGAM DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

45: MASKANDAR ALI
C/O ANFAR ALI AGE 66 YERAS VILLAGE JAMUNA MOUDANGA DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

46: ALA UDDIN
S/O ABDUL LATIF LASKAR AGE 50 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON
DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

47: HIFJUR RAHMAN
S/O ABDUL JALIL AGE 27 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

48: ABDUL JALIL
S/O ABDUL KADER AGE 68 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM

49: LAL MIYAN
S/O KURMAN ALI AGE 50 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA DISTRICT

NAGAON
ASSAM

50: AFIYA BEGUM
W/O MUSABBIR ALI AGE 48 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON
DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

51: ABDUL MANNAN
S/O LT ABDUL KHALIK AGE 40 YEARS VILLAGE PUB JAMUNA GAON
DISTRICT NAGAON
ASSAM

52: SIRAJ UDDIN
S/O TINU MIYAN AGE 30 YEARS VILLAGE SWAPUR GAON DISTRICT
NAGAON
ASSAM
VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 8 ORS
TO BE REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF ASSAM
JANATA BHAWAN
ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI-781006

2:SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
ENVIRONMENT FORESTS DEPARTMENT
JANATA BHAWAN ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

3:COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
REVENUE DISASTER MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
JANATA BHAWAN ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

4:PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS AND HEAD OF FOREST
FORCE AND WILDLIFE
O/O THE PCCF HOFF
ASSAM
ARANYA BHAWAN
PANJABARI
GUWAHATI- 781037

5:DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER

NAGAON SOUTH DIVISION
HOJAI
ASSAM.

6:DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
HOJAI
ASSAM

7:SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
HOJAI
ASSAM

8:CIRCLE OFFICER
DOBOKA REVENUE CIRCLE
HOJAI ASSAM.

9:OFFICER IN CHARGE
MURAJHAR POLICE STATION
HOJAI
ASSAM

Advocate for : S LASKAR
Advocate for : GA
ASSAM appearing for THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 8 ORS

Linked Case : WA/212/2026

ABU BAKKAR AND 19 ORS.
C/O- NAJIR UDDIN
VILL- 74 PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

2: MAHARAM ALI
C/O- ABDUL BARIVILL- 72 PACHIM JAMUNA GAON ROAD
DIST- HOJAI

3: ABDUL MATLIB
C/O- RAMICH UDDIN
VILL- 99 PACHIM JAMUNA ROAD
DIST- HOJAI

4: DULAL AHMED
C/O- HAZRAT ALI
VILL-PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

5: SAMJID ALI
C/O- MUDARIS ALI
VILL- PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

6: KAMAR UDDIN
C/O- ALI RAJA
VILL- 044 UDMARI GAON ROAD
DIST- HOJAI

7: ISMAIL ALI
C/O- JONAB ALI
VILL- 02 PUB JAMUNA GAON ROAD
DIST- HOJAI

8: ABDUL KHALIK
C/O- MAKLIS ALI
VILL-PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

9: HUSSAIN AHMED
C/O- MAKBUL ALI
VILL-PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

10: BATAI MIYA
C/O- MOIAR ALI
VILL- GHUNIRPAR
DIST- HOJAI

11: NASIR UDDIN
C/O- ABDUL MANNAF
VILL- UDMARI
DIST- HOJAI

12: MOHAMMAD HASON AHMED
C/O- YASIN ALI
VILL-PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

13: ASAB UDDIN
C/O- ALI RAJA
VILL- 043 UDMARI GAON ROAD
DIST- HOJAI

14: JAMAL UDDIN
C/O- FAIJUR @ FOIJUR RAHMAN
VILL- PACHIM JAMUNA GAON

DIST- HOJAI

15: TAJ UDDIN
C/O- MAHMAD ALI
VILL- 65 PACHIM JAMUNA GAON ROAD
DIST- HOJAI

16: MD ALAUR @ ALAUR RAHMAN
C/O- LATE ABDUR RAHMAN
VILL- UDMARI
DIST- HOJAI

17: KACHIM ALI LASKAR
C/O- WAZID ALI LASKAR
VILL-PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

18: KHAIRUL ISLAM LASKAR
C/O- WAZID ALI LASKAR
VILL-PACHIM JAMUNA GAON
DIST- HOJAI

19: SAHARBAN BIBI
C/O- MATIUR RAHMAN
VILL-PACHIM JAMUNA GAON ROAD
DIST- HOJAI

20: ALIM UDDIN
C/O- KUTUB @ KUUTUB ALI
VILL- 114 PACHIM JAMUNA GAON ROAD
DIST- HOJAI
VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 13 ORS.
TO BE REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF ASSAM
JANATA BHAWAN ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

2:SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT
JANATA BHAWAN (ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX)
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

3:COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

JANATA BHAWAN (ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX)
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

4:PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS HEAD OF FORESTS AND
HEAD OF FORCE AND WILDLIFE
O/O THE PCCF AND HOFF
ASSAM
ARANYA BHAWAN
PANJABARI
GUWAHATI- 781037

5:DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER
SOUTH NAGAON DIVISION
HOJAI
ASSAM.

6:DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER
NAGAON DIVISION
NAGAON
ASSAM

7:DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
HOJAI
ASSAM

8:DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
NAGAON
ASSAM

9:SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
HOJAI
ASSAM

10:SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
NAGAON
ASSAM

11:CIRCLE OFFICER
DOBOKA REVENUE CIRCLE
HOJAI ASSAM

12:CIRCLE OFFICER
KAMPUR REVENUE CIRCLE
NAGAON ASSAM.

13:OFFICER IN CHARGE
MURAJHAR POLICE STATION

HOJAI
ASSAM.

14:OFFICER IN CHARGE
KACHUA POLICE STATION
NAGAON
ASSAM.

Advocate for : S LASKAR
Advocate for : GA
ASSAM appearing for THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 13 ORS.

Linked Case : WA/216/2026

ISMAIL HUSSAIN AND 186 ORS.
S/O- MANIR UDDIN
VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM.

2: JAMAL UDDIN
S/O- SAHED ALI AGE- 42 YEARS
VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR. DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

3: DANESH ALI
S/O- LT KARAM ALI AGE- 85 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

4: TAIJ UDDIN
S/O- AJIJUL HOQUE AGE- 36 YEARS

VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

5: YAKUB ALI
S/O- ABDUL RASHID
AGE- 55 YEARS
VILL- LOCHNA BARIDIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

6: IDRISH ALI
S/O- LT UMED ALI AGE- 62 YEARS

VILL- NARASINGH BORI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

7: SAIDUL ISLAM
S/O- ABDUL GONI AGE- 28 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

8: JAKIR HUSSAIN
S/O- ALFAJ UDDIN AGE- 25 YEARS

VILL-BARABEEL DHANSHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

9: BILLAL MIYAN
S/O- LT JABED ALI AGE- 73 YEARS

VILL- LALUNG GAON DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

10: DIN ISLAM
S/O- BILLAL MIYA AGE- 32 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

11: MAHIDUL ISLAM
S/O- HAMED ALI

AGE- 38 YEARS
VILL- MEHERIPAR

DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

12: ABDUL RASHID
S/O- SHOHIDUL ISLAM AGE- 31 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

13: MUSLEM UDDIN
S/O- ISHUB ALI
AGE- 52 YEARS

VILL- PANDITGHAT DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

14: NIJAM UDDIN
S/O- ABDUL KUDDUS AGE- 50 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

15: INTAJ ALI
S/O- MAFEJ ALI AGE- 65 YEARS
VILL- 1 NO GAGALAMARI DIST- MARIGAON
ASSAM

16: ABU BAKKAR SIDDIK
S/O- ABDUL MATALIB
AGE- 30 YEARS
VILL- PANDITGHAT
KAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

17: ARFAN ALI
S/O- MIR HUSSAIN AGE- 26 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

18: MAYDUL ISLAM
S/O- ISAB ALI
AGE- 55 YEARS

VILL- BORBIL DHANSILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

19: SALEHA KHATUN
C/O-ABDUS SATTAR
AGE-47 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

20: IKRAMUL ISLAM
S/O- ABDUL SATTAR AGE- 33 YEARS
VILL- PANDHIT GHAT DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

21: SHARIFUL ISLAM

S/O- RAHMAT ALI AGE- 41 YEARS
VILL- BORBEEL DHANSHILA ISLAPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

22: FAIJUL ISLAM

S/O- RUSTUM ALI AGE- 39 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHAN CHALA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

23: ELIYAS AHAMMED
S/O- JAYNAL ABDIN AGE- 25 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

24: IKRAMUL HAQUE
C/O-ABDUL SATTAR
AGE-38 YEARS

VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

25: ABDUL MATALIB
S/O- REJAT ALI AGE- 51 YEARS

VILL- PANDITGHAT DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

26: SAIDUL ISLAM
S/O- RUSTUM ALI AGE- 43 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

27: DILDAR HUSSAIN
S/O- AYUB ALI AGE- 26 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

28: AKATARA KHATUN
C/O- NUR HUSSAIN AGE- 35 YEARS
VILL- DHANSHILA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

29: MARCHAB ALI
S/O- MARFAT ALI
AGE- 60 YEARSVILL- DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

30: BABUL HUSSAIN
S/O- SAMAR ALI

AGE- 40 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

31: HAMEDA KHATUN
C/O- ABDUL MUTALIP
AGE- 44 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

32: ABDUL KARIM
S/O- LT SIDDIQUE ALI AGE- 55 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

33: OMAR ALI
S/O- JALAL UDDIN AGE- 27 YEARS

VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

34: BABAR ALI
S/O- KURFAN ALI AGE- 46 YEARS

VILL- AMTALA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

35: TOFAZUL ISLAM
S/O- ABDUL GONI AGE- 32 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

36: RASHIDUL ISLAM
S/O- AHAMMAD ALI AGE- 36 YEARS
VILL- MADHABPARA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

37: ABDUL REJAK
S/O- IBRAHIM ALI AGE- 48 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON

ASSAM

38: JALAL UDDIN
S/O- HASIM UDDIN AGE- 42 YEARS
VILL- KANDOLIMARI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

39: RAHIM UDDIN
S/O. ILAHI BAKS
VILL.- LONGJUP N.C. DIST. NAGAON
ASSAM.

40: JAKIR HUSSAIN
S/O- AYUB ALI
AGE- 38 YEARS
VILL- DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

41: KASEM ALI
S/O- IDRISH ALI AGE- 38 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

42: AIMAN NESSA
C/O- FAKAR UDDINAGE- 48 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

43: SAMAN ALI
S/O- SAMIR UDDINAGE- 48 YEARS.
VILL- GORUBAT
MORANGIAL.
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

44: ABUL KASHEM
S/O-ABDUL JABBAR
AGE-38 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

45: ABDUL KALAM
S/O- LT ABDUL JABBAR AGE- 35 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

46: GIYAS UDDIN
S/O- ANUWAR HUSSAIN AGE- 57 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

47: NIJAM UDDIN
S/O- ABDUL RASHID AGE- 41 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

48: RIYAJ UDDIN

S/O- ABDUL KUDDUS AGE- 33 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

49: SEKANDAR ALI
S/O- SAMS UDDIN AGE- 42 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

50: ABDUL HOQUE
S/O- ABDUL REJAK AGE- 27 YEARS
VILL- URIAGRANT TUBUKI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

51: RAFIKUL HUSSAIN
S/O- DANESH ALI AGE- 45 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

52: SOHIDUL ISLAM
S/O- MOFIJUL ISLAM AGE- 28 YEARS
VILL- DIHINGBARI PATHAR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

53: SAH ALOM

S/O- ABDUL GANI AGE- 50 YEARS
VILL- AMATALA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

54: NUR HUSSAIN
S/O- LT AHAMMAD ALI AGE- 73 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

55: AFAJ UDDIN

S/O- MIR HUSSAIN AGE- 25 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

56: NAJIM UDDIN

S/O- ABDUL KARIM AGE- 40 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

57: AFAJ UDDIN

C/O-ABDUL KUDDUS

AGE-50 YEARS

VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

58: HUSSAIN ALI

S/O- AHAMMAD ALI

AGE- 33 YEARS

VILL- KAMPUR ROAD BARABEEL DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

59: SOFIKUL HUSSAIN

S/O- RAHMAT ALI

AGE- 41 YEARS

VILL- BORBEEL DHANSHILA ISLAPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

60: ANAR HUSSAIN

S/O- LT SAMAR ALI AGE- 30 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

61: KHUDEJA KHATUN

C/O- SAMAR ALI

AGE- 50 YEARS

VILL- KAMPUR ROAD
BARBEEL ISLAMPURDIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

62: FARUK AHMED

S/O- ISMAIL ALI

AGE- 33 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR

DIST- NAGAON

ASSAM

63: DULAL HUSSAIN
S/O- MAINU UDDIN AGE- 39 YEARS

VILL- 9 NO KHERONI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

64: ABDUCH SALAM
S/O- SAHED ALI AGE- 32 YEARS

VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

65: MAJIDA KHATUN
C/O- AJGAR ALI
AGE- 63 YEARS
VILL- JURIPAR
BARPANI BAGANDIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

66: AJGAR ALI
S/O- ABDUL RAHIM AGE- 26 YEARS

VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

67: ABDUL RAHIM
S/O- LT IDRIS ALI
AGE- 55 YEARS
VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

68: ABDUL REJAK
S/O- LT SAHAB UDDIN AGE- 60 YEARS
VILL- URIAGRANT TUBUKI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

69: MANIK JAN
S/O- FAKHRUL ISLAM AGE- 55 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

70: UMOR ALI
S/O- SAHED ALI AGE- 36 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

71: AJAR UDDIN
S/O- ALI AKBOR AGE- 31 YEARS
VILL- SARUCHALA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

72: KITAB ALI
S/O- MD ALI AKBAR AGE- 19 YEARS

VILL- SARUCHALA
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

73: JINNAT ALI
S/O- ABDUL KARIM AGE- 28 YEARS

VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

74: SAFIQUUL ISLAM
S/O- ROYSUDDIN
AGE- 50 YEARS VILL- ALTANGANI
JURIA
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

75: SAYED ALI
S/O- ALAL UDDIN AGE- 23 YEARS

VILL- BORBILL DHANCILA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

76: JYABUR RAHMAN
S/O- RAHMAT ALI AGE- 25 YEARS

VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

77: ASIKUL RAHMAN
S/O- MANIR UDDIN AGE- 55 YEARS

VILL- BARBIL DHANSILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

78: SHORIFA KHATUN
W/O- ABUL HUSSAIN
AGE- 45 YEARS
VILL- JURIPAR

KAMPURDIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

79: TAIJ UDDIN
S/O- ABDUL KUDDUS AGE- 33 YEARS
VILL- BARABEEL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

80: BARAK MIYA
S/O- SAHED ALI AGE- 37 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

81: MOMIN ALI
S/O- CHAN MIYA AGE- 35 YEARS

VILL- BARABEEL DHANASHILA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

82: SAIFUL ISLAM
S/O- ROYSUDDIN

AGE- 50 YEARSVILL- SHIMALU AATI GAON PACHIM KHANDADIST-
NAGAON
ASSAM

83: OMAR ALI
S/O- ABDUL GANI AGE- 42 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

84: AHAMMAD ALI
S/O- MAHIBUL HAQUE AGE- 49 YEARS
VILL- KAMPUR ROAD
PONDHIT GHAT DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

85: ABU SAMA
S/O- ABDUL JABBAR
AGE- 54 YEARS
VILL- SALMARADIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

86: JAKIR HUSSAIN
S/O- SAHED ALI AGE- 51 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

87: ATIKUL ISLAM
S/O- RAHMAT ALI AGE- 28 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

88: SHARIFUL ISLAM
S/O- SAMS UDDIN AGE- 39 YEARS

VILL- BARABILL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

89: RAHMAT ALI
S/O- ABDUL HEKIM AGE- 85 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

90: ATABUR RAHMAN
S/O- RAHMAT ALI AGE- 27 YEARS

VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

91: JIYABUR RAHMAN
S/O- ALAL UDDIN AGE- 28 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

92: ABU KALAM
S/O- ABDUL AJID
AGE- 39 YEARS
VILL- BARPANI BAGAN
KACHUADIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

93: SIRAJ UDDIN
S/O- ABDUL MANNAF AGE- 62 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

94: HABIBUR RAHMAN
S/O- ABDUL GANI AGE- 28 YEARS
VILL- 9 NO KHERONI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

95: YASIN ALI
S/O- MUKASHED ALI AGE- 48 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

96: INSAN ALI
S/O- SHAID ALI AGE- 33 YEARS VILL-BARABEEL DHANASHILA
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

97: ABDUL JALIL
S/O- AKKAS ALI AGE- 56 YEARS VILL- BORPANI ROAD NEAR MASZID
BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

98: AMJAT ALI
S/O- JAYNAL ABDIN AGE- 39 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

99: MUSTAFA ALOM
S/O- LT KHAIRUL ISLAM AGE- 28 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DAKSHIN
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

100: NASHID ALI
S/O- TAIYAB ALI AGE- 38 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

101: NAJIT ALI
S/O- TAIYAB ALI AGE- 32 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

102: FAIJUL ISLAM
S/O- SHAHIDUL ISLAM AGE- 40 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

103: ABDUL KARIM
S/O- LT NIJAM UDDIN AGE- 61 YEARS VILL- HOJ GAON DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

104: JAKIR HUSSAIN
S/O- ABDUL LATIF AGE- 45 YEARS VILL- KANDHULI MARI NO 2
DIST- NAGAON

ASSAM

105: MAINUDDIN

S/O- JALAL UDDIN AGE- 29 YEARS VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

106: KUDDUS ALI

S/O- AHAMMAD ALI AGE- 35 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

107: HASEN ALI

S/O- AHAMMAD ALI AGE- 47 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

108: SHUKUR ALI

S/O- ABDUL RAHIM AGE- 27 YEARS
VILL- PANDITGHAT DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

109: KUTUBUL ALOM

S/O- LT ASAN ALI AGE- 57 YEARS VILL- BARBIL DONSALA
ISLAMPUR
BARPANI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

110: ABDUL HANNAN

S/O- KUTUBUL ALAM AGE- 31 YEARS VILL- BARBIL DHANSILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

112: MUKSIDUL ISLAM

S/O- KASUM ALI AGE- 36 YEARS
VILL- UDHANTULA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

113: ABU HANIFA

S/O- ABDUL CHAMED AGE- 35 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

114: HARUN RASHID

S/O- ABU BAKKAR SIDDIQUE AGE- 39 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL
DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

115: AHAMAT ALI
S/O- LT ABDUL GAFUR AGE- 48 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

116: ALI AKBAR
S/O- ABDUL JALIL AGE- 32 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

117: MUKSIDUL ISLAM
S/O- LT SHAMAR ALI AGE- 35 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

118: ISMAT ALI
S/O- SAYED ALI AGE- 26 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

119: HASMAT ALI
S/O- LT IDRISH ALI AGE- 40 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
BORPANI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

120: HORIDUL ISLAM
S/O- SURUJ ALI AGE- 30 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

121: NAJRUL ISLAM
S/O- KUDDUS ALI AGE- 30 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

122: HAMIDA KHATUN
C/O- SAN MIYAN AGE- 40 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

123: FAIJUL HAQUE
S/O- KUDDUS ALI AGE- 40 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

124: JAIN UDDIN
S/O- ABDUL JABBAR AGE- 68 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA

ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

125: KASEM ALI
S/O- ABDUL JABBAR AGE- 49 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

126: SURUJ ALI
S/O- ABDUL RAHMAN AGE- 60 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

127: RAJAB ALI
S/O- AMIR HUSSAIN AGE- 36 YEARS VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

128: SAIDUL ISLAM
S/O- MIRAJ ALI AGE- 42 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

129: GULJAR HUSSAIN
S/O- LT SAMIR UDDIN AGE- 47 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

130: FAKRUL ISLAM
S/O- MAHAMMAD ALI AGE- 45 YEARS VILL- JARA MARI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

131: SHARIF UDDIN
S/O- JAHED ALI AGE- 45 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

132: GULJAR HUSSAIN
S/O- LT ASAN ALI AGE- 40 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

133: AZIZUL ISLAM
S/O- KASUM ALI AGE- 32 YEARSVILL- UDHANTULADIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

134: MUKSHIDUL ISLAM
S/O- SAMIR UDDIN AGE- 42 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA

ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

135: NIJAM UDDIN
S/O- SURJ ALI AGE- 32 YEARSVILL- BORBIL
BORPANI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

136: JALAL UDDIN
S/O- LATE MAFIJ UDDIN AGE- 65 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

137: AJIJUL HAQUE
S/O- KUDDUS ALI AGE- 40 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

138: DILDAR HUSSAIN
S/O- AYUB ALI AGE- 26 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

139: ANJAR HUSSAIN
S/O- AYUB ALI AGE- 26 YEARS
VILL- BARBILL DHANSHILA ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

140: ANARUL ISLAM
S/O- SURUJ ALI AGE- 40 YEARSVILL- BARABEEL DHANSALA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

141: HAJRAT ALI
S/O- ABDUL HUSSEN AGE- 55 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

142: SAHED ALI
S/O- ABDUL SAMED AGE- 28 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

143: HABIBUL ISLAM
S/O- RAHIM UDDIN AGE- 33 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON

ASSAM

144: ABDUL HANNAN
S/O- AMIR HUSSAIN AGE- 44 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANASHILA
ISLAMPUR DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

145: MANNAS ALI
S/O- NAJIM UDDIN AGE- 48 YEARSVILL- ISLAMPUR
DHANASHILA DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

146: JAMAL HUSSEN
S/O- LT ASAN ALI AGE- 46 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

147: SIDDIKUL ISLAM
S/O- SAMAR ALI AGE- 46 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL ISLAMPUR
BORPANI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

148: MUBARAK ALI
S/O- SAMIR UDDIN AGE- 40 YEARS VILL- BARPANI BAGAH DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

149: HAMIDA KHATUN
C/O- AJIJUL HAQUEAGE- 45 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

150: KHALILUR RAHMAN
S/O- LT RAKAMAN ALI AGE- 64 YEARS VILL- BORBIL DHANSILA
ISLAMPUR
BORPANI DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

151: AMIR HUSSAIN
C/O-ABDUR RAHMAN AGE-60 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

152: HAMEDA KHATUN
C/O- ABDUL MUTALIP AGE- 44 YEARSVILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA
ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

153: HANIF ALI
C/O-ABDUL HAMID AGE-49 YEARS
VILL- BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

154: ABDUL SATTAR
C/O-LATE HURMUJ ALI
AGE-45 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

155: NURJHAN BEGUM
C/O-CHALIM UDDIN.
AGE-64 YEARSR/O-VILL-PUB FUTALJAR DIST -NAGAON
ASSAM

156: ABDUL MATALIB
C/O-KERAMAT ALI.
AGE-75 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

157: FATIMA KHATUN
C/O-MANTAJ ALI
AGE-56 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

158: SARUFA KHATUN
C/O-HABIBUR RAHMAN
AGE-42 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

159: MUKSIDUL ISLAM
C/O-MAJIBUR RAHMAN
AGE-29 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

160: NURUL AMIN
C/O-LATE OMAR ALI
AGE-56 YEARS

R/O-LAHARIGHAT
MORIGAON

ASSAM

161: MOIN UDDIN
C/O-IMAM ALI
AGE-33 YEARS

R/O-VILL CHAHARIA PAM
BHURAGAON
DIST -MORIGAON
ASSAM

162: IMAMUL HOQUE
C/O-MUJAMMIL HUSSAIN
AGE-30 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

163: RASIDUL HOQUE
C/O-IBRAHIM ALI
AGE-31 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

164: FIRUJA KHATUN
C/O-KARAM ALI
AGE-47 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

165: SAMSUL HOQUE
C/O-MAJUM ALI

AGE-55 YEARS

R/O-GEREKANI BILL
DHING
DIST -NAGAON
ASSAM

166: MAMIN ALI
C/O-ABDUL KARIM

AGE-46 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON

ASSAM

167: BEGUM
C/O-SAHAR ALI

AGE-50 YEARS

VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

168: A KADIR
C/O-HABIBUR RAHMAN

AGE-42 YEARS

VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

169: A KHALEK
C/O-HABIBUR RAHMAN

AGE-37 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

170: ABDOLLAH
C/O-IMAN ALI

AGE-25 YEARS

VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

171: ANAR HUSSAIN
C/O-SAMAR ALI

AGE-30 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

172: AMINUL HOQUE
C/O-JIYABUR RAHMAN

AGE-24 YEARSR/O-ROWMARI

DIST -NAGAON
ASSAM

176: ASAHABUL ALI
C/O-MANTAJ ALI

AGE-36 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

177: A HALIM
C/O-TALEB ALI
AGE-66 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

178: HAJRAT ALI
C/O-HUSSEN ALI

AGE-46 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

179: AKBAR ALI
C/O-HUSSEN ALI

AGE-42 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

180: ABED ALI
C/O-YAKUB ALI

AGE-40 YEARS

R/O-ROWMARI
RUPAHIDIST -NAGAON
ASSAM

181: SAMSUL HOQUE
C/O-LATE AYUB HOQUE

AGE-42 YEARSR/O- VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

182: NURUL ISLAM
C/O-IBRAHIM ALI.
AGE-50 YEARS
VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

183: ABUL HUSSAIN
C/O-ABDUL AZID

AGE-30 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

184: ASIRUN NESSA
C/O-ABDUL KUDDUS

AGE-62 YEARS

VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

185: IYAD ALI
C/O-YAKUB ALI

AGE-51 YEARS VILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

186: MARFAT ALI
C/O-LATE HUSSAIN ALI

AGE-62 YEARSVILL-BARBEEL DHANCHILA ISLAMPUR
DIST- NAGAON
ASSAM

187: A RAHMAN
C/O-FAKRUL ISLAM

AGE-30 YEARS
VILL-JENGANI GAON
DHING
DIST -NAGAON
ASSAM
VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 13 ORS.

TO BE REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF ASSAM
JANATA BHAWAN ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

2:THE SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT
JANATA BHAWAN ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

3:THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
ASSAM
REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
JANATA BHAWAN ASSAM SECRETARIAT COMPLEX
DISPUR
GUWAHATI- 781006

4:THE PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS AND HEAD OF
FOREST FORCE AND WILDLIFE

O/O THE PCCF HOFF
ASSAM
ARANYA BHAWAN
PANJABARI
GUWAHATI- 781037.

5:THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER
NAGAON DIVISION
NAGAON
ASSAM
782001

6:THE DISTRICT LEVEL COMMITTEE FOR REMOVAL OF FOREST
ENCROACHMENT
OFFICE OF THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER
NAGAON FOREST DIVISION
NAGAON
ASSAM
782001

7:THE DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
NAGAON
ASSAM
782001

8:THE DISTRICT COMMISSIONER

MORIGAON
ASSAM
782105

9:THE DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
HOJAI
782442

10:THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
NAGAON
ASSAM
782001

11:THE SUPREINTENDENT OF POLICE
MORIGAON
ASSAM
782105

12:THE SUPREINTENDENT OF POLICE
HOJAI
782442

13:THE CIRCLE OFFICER
KAMPUR REVENUE CIRCLE
NAGAON
ASSAM
782426

14:THE OFFICER IN CHARGE
KACHUA POLICE STATION
NAGAON
ASSAM
782426

Advocate for : MR. A R BHUYAN
Advocate for : GA
ASSAM appearing for THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 13 ORS.

BEFORE

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARUN DEV CHOUDHURY

For the Appellants : Mr. A.R. Bhuyan, Sr. Advocate,

assisted by Mr. S Laskar, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. P.N. Goswami, Sr. Advocate

Date on which the Judgment was Reserved:24.06.2026

Date of the pronouncement of

Judgment : 25.06.2026

Whether the pronouncement

is the operative part of the

Judgment : NA.

Whether the full

Judgment has been pronounced: Yes.

JUDGMENT & ORDER (CAV)

(A.D. Choudhury, J)

1. These intra-court appeals arise out of a common judgment and order dated 08.06.2026, passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby a batch of writ petitions, challenging speaking orders, issued by the Divisional Forest Officer, Nagao Division, came to be dismissed.
2. By the said speaking orders, the competent authority concluded that the appellants were in unauthorised occupation of lands, forming part of various notified reserve forests and directed consequential action in accordance with law.

3. The facts are not in dispute. The appellants claim to be residents of different villages situated within or adjoining the areas comprising the Barapani, Lutumai, Kaki and other Reserve Forests in the district of Nagaon.
4. Their case is that they and their predecessors have been residing in these areas for decades and have established permanent dwellings, cultivated lands, and developed sources of livelihood thereon.
5. The foundation of their claim is that, following earlier eviction operations undertaken in the year 1970, certain displaced families were permitted by the Forest Department to undertake cultivation and temporary residence under the Taungya system. According to the appellants, original Taungya settlers were allotted land for plantation activities and habitation, and many of the present occupants derive their position either as descendants of such settlers or through transfer, inheritance or long uninterrupted occupation.
6. To substantiate this assertion, reliance has been placed upon Taungya certificates, communications exchange between Governmental Authorities, Departmental Letters, Telegrams, Electoral Rolls, Certificates issued by Panchayat Authorities, Annual Pattas, Land Revenue Receipts and similar documents. It is contended that these materials demonstrate recognition of their occupation by the State and establish either an accrued legal right or at least a legitimate expectation that their possession would not be disturbed.
7. The appellants further submit that over the years, public infrastructure has developed in the concerned areas, including school buildings and roads; that local Administrative Authorities have recognised the settlements for several purposes and that Governmental conduct over an extended period evidences acceptance of their occupation. They, therefore, contend that the impugned action of the Forest Authorities is arbitrary, contrary to past Governmental conduct and violative of principles of fairness.
8. The controversy has a long, protracted history of litigation.
9. Upon the issuance of eviction notices in 2025, several affected persons approached this court by filing writ petitions challenging the forest department's proposed action.

10. In some of these Writ proceedings, the petitioners were granted liberty to submit representations to the competent authorities, together with documents in support of their claims.
11. In subsequent proceedings, this court directed that the claim of the occupants be verified afresh and that an opportunity be afforded to them to participate in the process and produce all relevant materials before any final decision affecting their occupation was taken. Orders passed eventually came under consideration before the Supreme Court in *Abdul Khalek vs. State of Assam & Ors.*, reported in *2026 SCC Online SC 184*.
12. In *Abdul Khalek (supra)*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court underscored the imperative of preserving and protecting reserve forest while ensuring that no coercive action is taken without adherence to the fair procedure. The court directed the State to undertake a scientific and coordinated verification of the land under occupation through an appropriate mechanism, to afford the affected persons an opportunity to produce documents and raise their claim, to examine whether they possess any legally recognisable right or protection under the applicable law, and thereafter pass a reasoned order before proceeding further.

The Supreme Court also accepted the procedure for carrying out such an exercise, to be fair.

The emphasis of the Supreme Court was thus on procedural fairness and the accurate identification of the status of the land and its occupants, without diluting the statutory regime governing reserve forests or creating substantive rights in favour of a person unable to establish lawful rights/ entitlements.

13. Thus, the Supreme Court, while disposing of the aforesaid writ petition, emphasised the need to uphold the rule of law and protect forest lands while simultaneously assuring that persons facing eviction are afforded procedural safeguards and an opportunity to establish such rights, if any, as may be available to them.
14. Pursuant to the observations and directions issued by the Supreme Court, the Government of Assam constituted Committees comprising officers of the Forest and

Revenue Departments to undertake a comprehensive verification exercise. The Committees were entrusted with examining the relevant records, identifying the precise location of the lands under occupation, verifying whether such lands fell within the notified Reserve Forest and considering the materials produced by the occupants before the appropriate speaking order was passed. Thereafter, notices were issued to the appellants individually, representations were invited, Forest and Revenue Officials undertook joint verification, and respective Speaking Orders were passed, recording, inter alia, that the lands under occupation fell within the notified Reserve Forest and that no legally cognizable documents conferring right, title or authority over such lands had been produced by the occupants.

15. It is these all Speaking Orders which were assailed before the learned Single Judge and upon dismissal of the Writ petitions have given rise to the present appeals.
16. The principal submission advanced by Mr. A. R. Bhuyan, learned Senior Counsel for the appellants, is that the authorities have proceeded on an erroneous assumption that they are land encroachers upon reserved forest land.
17. According to them, their occupation has historical roots traceable to Governmental decisions made in 1970, pursuant to which displaced families were accommodated under the Taungya system. It is contended that various certificates, Governmental communications and departmental records relied upon by them establish official recognition of such occupation and negate the allegation of unlawful entry. It is further submitted that many of the present occupants have succeeded in the interest of the original Taungya settlers and therefore, possess rights which the State cannot ignore.
18. Learned Counsel appearing for the appellants has also relied upon Electoral Rolls, Aadhaar Cards, Voter Identity Cards, Ration Cards, Electricity Connections, Panchayat Records, Annual Pattas and Revenue Receipts to contend that multiple organs of the State have consistently recognised the settlements and extended civic and administrative facilities to the occupants. It is argued that such conduct creates a legitimate expectation that the occupants would either be regularised or, at the very least, not be summarily evicted.

19. The learned Senior Counsel further contends that the verification exercise undertaken pursuant to the directions of the Supreme Court in *Abdul Khalek (supra)* was not conducted in the manner contemplated by law, and the authorities failed to appreciate the historical documents and evidence produced by them.
20. According to them, the Speaking Orders have been passed mechanically without proper consideration of the individual facts and circumstances of each case.
21. Mr. Bhuyan, learned Senior Counsel has also argued that several families have resided in the areas for generations and that the balance between environmental concerns and human habitation ought to be struck in a manner that protects settled communities from displacement, particularly when their occupation is asserted to have originated under Governmental arrangements.
22. Per contra, Mr. P.N. Goswami, learned Senior counsel, appearing for the State, contends that the lands in question indisputably form part of duly notified Reserve Forests and that no legally enforceable right has ever been created in favour of the appellants or their predecessors.
23. According to Mr. Goswami, the Taungya arrangements relied upon by the appellants were purely temporary administrative measures intended to facilitate plantation activities. They did not create permanent heritable or transferable rights over forest land. It is further submitted that public documents such as Aadhaar Cards, Electoral Rolls, Ration Cards, Electricity Bill or Certificates issued by local authorities neither create nor recognise title and cannot override statutory notifications constituting Reserved Forests. The respondents also contend that after the enactment of the Forests (Conservation) Act 1980, no settlement or diversion of forest land can be recognised except in accordance with the statutory mandate.
24. The State asserts that the procedure directed by the Supreme Court has been scrupulously followed and that committees comprising Forest and Revenue Officials carried out joint verification using scientific methods; that opportunities were afforded to every occupant to produce documents, and that reasoned Speaking Orders were

passed after due consideration of all materials placed before the authorities.

25. The learned Single Judge undertook an extensive examination of the pleadings, the statutory framework governing Reserved Forests, the historical documents relied upon by the parties, and the directions issued by the Supreme Court in *Abdul Khalek (supra)*.

The learned Single Judge framed principal questions as to whether the authority had complied with the procedural safeguards envisaged by the Supreme Court in *Abdul Khalek (supra)* and whether the petitioners had established any legally enforceable right to remain within the reserved forests.

Upon consideration of the materials of record, the learned Single Judge concluded that the verification exercise undertaken by the committees satisfied the procedural safeguards contemplated by the Supreme Court, rejecting the challenge to the procedural validity of the exercise.

26. On merit of the claims, the learned Single Judge held that the appellants had failed to produce any document conferring title or any legally enforceable right over the lands in question.

The court observed that documents such as Aadhar Cards, Voter Identity Cards, Electoral Rolls, Ration Cards, Electricity Connections and similar records may establish identity or residence but do not create proprietary rights over forest land.

27. Likewise, the Taungya Certificates and contemporaneous Governmental communications were construed as reflecting temporary administrative arrangements and not confined to permanent, heritable or transferable rights.

28. The learned Single Judge further held that neither long possession nor equitable considerations could prevail against the Statutory Scheme governing reserve forests and the constitutional obligation of the State to protect them. Accordingly, the writ petitions were dismissed.

29. We have bestowed our anxious considerations on the challenge mounted by the appellants and also independently examined the materials placed before us. Let us now

deal with contentions raised before us, under the following headings:

I. The Constitution of the Committees and verification:

30. The materials on the records indicate that, pursuant to the directions issued by the Supreme Court, as recorded hereinabove, with a purpose to ensure that the determination was not founded merely on departmental assertions but upon a coordinated exercise involving both technical and revenue authorities, the verification exercise was carried out.
31. The verification exercise was designed to ascertain the precise location of the lands under occupation, correlate the same with the notified boundaries of the Reserve Forest, examine the documentary materials produced by the occupants and place the competent authority in a position to pass a reasoned order based upon objective criteria.
32. We find nothing on record to indicate that the Constitution of the Committees or the exercise undertaken by them was contrary to the directions issued by the Supreme Court or otherwise tainted by arbitrariness. Mere dissatisfaction with the outcome of the verification cannot by itself render the process invalid.

II. Opportunity to the Appellants:

33. We have also noticed that notices were issued to the appellants individually, requiring them to place their objections and supporting materials before the competent authority. Pursuant thereto, representations were submitted by the appellants, documents relied upon by them were taken on record, and thereafter the impugned speaking orders came to be passed.
34. The principles of natural justice do not insist upon any rigid or ritualistic formula. What they require is a fair opportunity to know the case sought to be made against a person

and an adequate opportunity to respond thereto. The doctrine is one of fairness.

35. In the present case, the appellants were aware of the allegations made against them, were informed that authorities considered their occupation to fall within the notified Reserve Forests, were invited to produce all documents in support of their claims, and, in fact, the appellants availed themselves of such opportunity.
36. There is nothing to indicate that the material documents sought to be produced were refused consideration or that appellants were denied participation in the process.

III. Requirement of Individual Considerations:

37. The argument of the learned counsel for the appellant that authorities mechanically rejected all claims without proper appreciation of the distinct factual backgrounds of individual occupants does not persuade us.
38. A reading of the Speaking Orders indicates that the authorities examined the claims projected by the prospective occupants, noticed the categories of documents relied upon by them and recorded reasons for concluding that such materials did not establish any legally enforceable right over the lands in question.
39. It is undoubtedly desirable that administrative orders with civil consequences contain adequate reasons. Equally, the law does not require prolixity or elaborate adjudicatory discussion akin to a judicial judgment.

The reasons need only disclosure of due application of mind to the issues arising for consideration, and indicate why the authority has accepted or rejected contentions advanced before it.

40. Tested on the above principles, the speaking orders cannot be characterised as cryptic or non-speaking merely because they do not deal separately with every document or every submission advanced by the appellants.

IV. Scientific Verification and Identification of Boundaries:

41. One of the principal grievances advanced before us concerns the methodology adopted for identifying whether the lands under occupation fall within the notified reserve forest. The learned Senior counsel for the appellants also contends that the digitised or GIS-based map relied upon by the authorities has no statutory sanctity and therefore could not have been used for determining that the appellants occupy land within reserve forests.
42. We find no merit in the submission.
43. The learned Single Judge has noted that the authorities undertook verification through the joint participation of Forest and Revenue Officials and employed scientific methods, including modern survey techniques and geospatial identification, to correlate the lands under occupation with the notified forest boundaries. The record further indicates that such exercise was undertaken pursuant to the procedural framework that has evolved and been accepted by the Supreme Court in *Abdul Khalek (supra)*.
44. The records available reveal that the legal basis for identifying the reserve forest is the original Gazette Notification and the boundary description contained therein. The digitised map does not create or alter those boundaries; it merely represents them in a modern geospatial format to facilitate accurate on-the-ground identification.
45. The methodology adopted by the State shows that the digital map is prepared by reading the original notification together with the accompanying sketch map and survey of Indian Toposheets, georeferencing them with orthorectified satellite imagery (OSI), and thereafter undertaking field verification using DGPS/DGNSS (Differential Global Navigation Satellite System).
46. The coordinates of boundary pillars and the encroachments were physically verified and integrated into the final GIS map. We have also perused the maps produced by way of additional affidavit before the learned Single Judge, which are part of the record, and which clearly show the encroached areas along with the boundary, with GPS

coordinates.

47. Thus, the electronic map is not the primary source of title or boundary determination but a scientific aid for implementing and visualising the boundaries already established by statutory notification. The appellants have produced no alternative materials, nor have they suggested any error in the methodology or conclusions reached therefrom.

48. The use of modern technology to identify and verify pre-existing notified boundaries cannot be faulted merely because the original notifications predate such technology. On the contrary, geo-referencing and DGPS-based verification enhance precision and transparency while remaining faithful to the original legal records. In any event, the impugned findings do not rest solely upon the digitised map.

They are supported by gazette notifications, the boundary schedule, Survey of India records, georeferenced overlays, and field verification undertaken by the competent authorities. The GIS map is therefore only one component of the evidentiary exercise and not the sole foundation of the decision. The appellants have not placed before us any convincing technical material demonstrating that the methodology itself was fundamentally flawed or that conclusions reached through such exercise are demonstratively erroneous. Bald assertions questioning the correctness of the survey, unsupported by cogent evidence, cannot displace the findings recorded through an official verification undertaken by the Competent Authority.

Significantly, no alternative survey of comparable evidentiary value has been produced by the appellants to establish that the lands occupied by them lie outside the notified boundaries of the Reserve Forest.

49. We accordingly reject the challenge to the validity or evidentiary use of the digitised map and hold that authorities were justified in relying upon the GIS-based exercise, read in conjunction with original statutory records and the field verification for identifying the location of the reserve forest boundaries and the alleged encroachments.

V. Onus of Proof:

50. The argument that the onus of proof lies upon the Forest Department to prove that the lands are situated within the Reserve Forest, and they have failed to discharge the same, also does not find favour with us.
51. The answer to the said argument lies in the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Abdul Khalek (supra)*.

The Hon'ble Apex Court has, in no uncertain terms, clarified that the Committee shall give the appellants an opportunity to *adduce evidence* to show that they have the right to occupy the land which is in their possession and that if it is found that there is an encroachment in the reserved forest area, action for removal therefrom shall be taken.

VI. Any prejudice resulting from such procedure adopted:

52. It is equally well settled that an alleged procedural irregularity would justify interference only when prejudice is shown to have resulted therefrom.
53. In the present case, despite repeated opportunities before the learned Single Judge, the appellants have not been able to point out any material document of title or legally cognizable right which remains excluded from consideration or which, if considered, would have altered the ultimate conclusion.
54. The grievance of the appellants, therefore, is directed more against the substantive findings recorded by the authorities than against any denial of opportunity.
55. Thus, after having independently evaluated the entire material on record, we concur with the conclusion reached by the learned Single Judge that the procedure adopted by the authorities substantially conforms to the safeguards emphasised by the Supreme Court in *Abdul Khalek (supra)* and satisfies the requirements of fairness and natural justice.

56. This, however, does not conclude the controversy.

VII. Whether Any Enforceable Rights are Available to The Appellants:

57. The more fundamental question remains whether the materials relied upon by the appellants, particularly the Taungya arrangement, Governmental Correspondence, Identity Documents, Panchayat Records, Annual Pattas, and other allied documents, confirm any legally enforceable right to continue in occupation of the lands forming part of the Notified Reserve Forest. We now proceed to examine that question.

58. This controversy must be approached by maintaining a clear distinction between proof of occupation and proof of legal entitlement.

A person may establish that he has been residing upon a particular parcel of land for several years or even decades. Still, that fact by itself does not answer the juridical question.

The real question for determination is whether such an occupation is sanctioned by law or capable of defeating statutory rights vested in the State under the Forest Conservation Act.

59. The appellants have undoubtedly produced numerous documents indicating residence, identity and long association with the localities concerned.

The decisive question, however, is whether those materials create, recognise, or evidence any right in law to continue in occupation of lands admittedly forming part of the notified reserve forest.

VIII. Status of the Land:

60. It is not seriously disputed before us that the lands identified in the Speaking Orders fall within the geographical limits of a duly notified reserve forest.

The appellants have not challenged the validity of the notifications constituting the reserve forest, nor have they established that the lands occupied by them were lawfully excluded therefrom.

61. Once an area stands notified as a reserve forest in accordance with law, the legal incidence flowing from such notification necessarily attaches to the land. Rights inconsistent with such notification cannot thereafter be assumed or inferred merely from prolonged occupation or administrative inaction.

Any person asserting a continuing right over such land must establish the same by reference to a legally recognised source.

62. In the present case, despite elaborate submissions, the appellants have not produced any statutory grant, settlement order or instrument recognised by law conferring upon them or their predecessors an enforceable property or possessory right over the reserve forest.

IX.Taungya Arrangements and Their Legal Effect:

63. Considerable emphasis has been placed on the Taungya system and the 1970s documents relating thereto.
64. It is argued that those arrangements constituted governmental recognition of the occupants and conferred rights that could be transmitted to successors.
65. We are unable to accept such a submission.
66. The materials relied upon indicate, at the highest, that certain displaced persons were permitted to undertake plantation activities or were temporarily accommodated under the Taungya system.

Such arrangements were essentially administrative measures intended to facilitate forestry operations and rehabilitation in a limited context.

They cannot, in the absence of clear statutory authority, be constituted as grants creating a permanent, heritable or transferable interest in forest land.

Equally significant is the absence of any material demonstrating that the competent authority intended to alienate reserve forest land or permanently divest the state of its rights therein.

Neither the language of the communications relied upon by the appellants nor the surrounding circumstances support such interference.

We are therefore in respectful agreement with the conclusions of the learned Single Judge that the Taungya documents relied upon by the appellants do not confer title or any legally enforceable right to continue in occupation of the reserve forest.

X.Claims derived from Original Taungya Settlers:

67. Several appellants seek to distinguish themselves by asserting that although they may not be original Taungya settlers, they have acquired possession through purchase, gift, inheritance or other private arrangements from persons who allegedly held Taungya rights.

Such derivative claims cannot be accepted for more than one reason.

In the first place, no person can ordinarily transfer a better title than he himself possesses.

In view of the determination made hereinabove as regards Taungya arrangements, no subsequent private transaction could enlarge or improve the legal status of such claimants.

Secondly, many of the documents relied on in support of such transfers are unregistered private arrangements or informal transactions, which, even otherwise, cannot operate to convey the rights in the reserve forest.

XI.Governmental correspondences and Internal communications:

68. The appellants have also relied upon various letters, telegrams and communications exchanged between Governmental authorities during different periods proposing their settlements.

Though these documents reveal issues of accommodation/settlements of families and managing forest settlements, such internal administrative communications or recommendations cannot be equated with a statutory order creating legal rights in favour of private individuals.

Executive correspondence often records proposals, suggestions or temporary arrangements intended for administrative purposes. However, unless translated into a formal decision by the competent authority in accordance with law, such correspondence cannot be treated as conferring enforceable rights.

XII. Public Documents relied upon by the Appellants:

69. Coming to the great reliance that has been placed on Aadhar Cards, Voter Identity Cards, Electoral Rolls, Ration Cards, Electricity Connections, Panchayat Certificates and similar documents, we are of the opinion that such cards may establish identity, facilitate participation in the electoral process, serve the public distribution system, facilitate supply of power, certifies residence or administrative particulars, however, none of these documents is intended to operate as an instrument of title or confirmed proprietary rights over immovable properties.

To hold otherwise would permit administrative convenience to override statutory prohibitions and would indirectly convert welfare documentation into instruments of title, a proposition unsupported by any principle of law.

XIII. Panchayat Notifications and Local Administration:

70. The learned Senior Counsel for the appellants has tremendously urged that the lands in question have been included within the territorial limits of Gaon Panchayat, constituted under Section 5 of the Panchayat Act 1994, and that the impugned speaking orders are vitiated for having failed to deal with this aspect specifically.
71. We are unable to accept the submission.
72. Section 5 of the Panchayat Act empowers the State Government to declare different local areas comprising Revenue Villages, etc., including Forest Villages, to be a Gaon Panchayat.
73. The State Government in *Abdul Khalek (supra)* took a specific stand before the Hon'ble Supreme Court that Lawful occupation within Forest Village, in such areas notified, must be independently established through the Jamabandi Register maintained by the Forest Department or through rights recognised under the Forest Rights Act 2006, and that unauthorised occupants within a Gaon Panchayat remain liable to be evicted in accordance with law. Such a procedural mechanism was accepted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Abdul Khalek (supra)* as conforming to the principles of fairness and due process.
74. We are also of the considered opinion that even assuming that a notification under Section 5 of the Assam Panchayat Act, 1994 was issued declaring Gaon Panchayat within territorial limits, which forms part of a reserve forest, such notification cannot either expressly or by implication amount to de-reservation, diversion or regularisation of forest land.
75. Any such notification or even statutory action having the effect of permitting non-forest use of reserve forest land or recognising a right inconsistent with its protected status would necessarily have to satisfy the requirement of the Forest Conversion Act, 1980.

In the absence of any such approval contemplated under the Central Legislation, no notification constituting a Gaon Panchayat can be construed as confining proprietary or occupancy rights over reserve forest land.

No such approval of the Central Government under the Forest Conservation Act,

1980, is admittedly available in the present case.

76. For the aforesaid reason, the contention of the appellants that the Notification issued under Section 5 of the Panchayat Act did not identify the respective villages as forest villages, where the appellants are allegedly residing, itself satisfies that they are possessing lands outside the reserved forest, and also cannot be accepted.

XIV.Claim Under Forest Rights Act'2006:

77. The plea founded upon the Forest Rights Act, 2006, in our opinion, is equally misconceived.
78. The said enactment does not create a general right in every person residing in or near the forest to continue in occupation thereof. Recognition of rights under the Forest Rights Act, 2006, operates within the statutory framework created by Parliament and only in favour of persons who satisfy the conditions prescribed therein.
79. The Act cannot be construed as authorising wholesale regularisation of encroachment or as impliedly overriding the safeguards embodied in the Forest Conservation Act, 1980, unless rights are duly recognised in accordance with the procedure established under the Act, 2006.

No person can invoke it as a shield against eviction from reserve forest land merely based on long occupation or inclusion within a Gaon Panchayat. The stand of the State before the Hon'ble Supreme Court as regards the requirement of incorporation of name in the Jamabandi maintained by the Forest Department is relatable to the recognition of such rights by the Forest Department.

80. In the present case, no such materials are admittedly available. No material has also been placed by the appellants to even remotely suggest that the appellants are forest-dwelling scheduled tribes and/ or other traditional forest dwellers to satisfy the eligibility conditions prescribed by the Act, 2006.

81. Mere residence within a forest area or inclusion of a settlement within a Gaon Panchayat is, therefore, insufficient to attract the protection of the Forest Rights Act.

A claimant must establish that it falls within the categories recognised by the Act and that the statutory process culminating in recognition of such rights has been duly completed.

82. The appellants have not demonstrated that any such rights have been recognised in their favour. Indeed, the State affidavit placed before the Supreme Court specifically contended that unauthorised occupants residing within Gaon Panchayat areas that fall within reserve forests remain liable to eviction. Such a stand of the state was held to be procedurally fair by the Hon'ble Apex Court.

83. In this backdrop, the omission of the speaking order to separately discuss the plea based upon inclusion within a Gaon Panchayat does not occasion any prejudice.

XV.Claim based on Annual Pattas, Revenue Receipts and Similar Materials:

84. Certain appellants have also relied upon annual pattas, land revenue receipts and similar documents.

85. An annual patta, by its very nature, does not confer absolute transferable rights, though it confers inheritable rights. However, such a patta is always subject to the statutory competence of the authority issuing it and the nature of the land concerned.

86. Admittedly, the Revenue Authorities have no jurisdiction, sanction, or authority under law to issue an annual patta inside a reserve forest. Thus, where the underlying land forms part of a reserve forest and no lawful authority exists for such occupation, such issuance of an annual patta or payment of land revenue does not advance the appellant's case.

XVI. Long Possession and Legitimate Expectation:

87. The arguments on legitimate expectation, long occupation, and the authorities' acquiescence in such occupation by extending public facilities also don't find our favour.
88. We are of the opinion that a long possession is undoubtedly a relevant factual circumstance. Nevertheless, the mere passage of time cannot, by itself, create legal rights over Reserve Forest land contrary to the Conservation Act.
89. Administrative tolerance, delay in evicting encroachers or enforcement of civic amenities cannot amount to recognition of proprietary rights over protected forest land.
90. Therefore, the doctrine of Legitimate Expectation is to of no help to the appellants. Such expectations must arise from a clear representation made by the competent authority *acting within the bounds of law*. It cannot be founded upon administrative inaction, temporary indulgence or conduct contrary to statutory provisions under the conservation or preservation of forest land.

More importantly, no principle of Legitimate Expectation or promissory estoppels can compel the State to act in derogation of legislation enacted for the protection of the forest or prevent the discharge of constitutional obligations cast upon public authorities.

XVII. Rehabilitation and Humanitarian Considerations:

91. After having answered the disputes relating to procedural impropriety and right of the petitioners, the remaining question that concerns this Court is the submissions regarding rehabilitation and humanitarian considerations, and whether any equitable relief can nevertheless be granted.
92. These questions shall now be examined.
93. Learned counsel for the appellants has relied upon *Olga Tellis Vs Bombay Municipal Corporation* reported in *AIR 1986 SC 180*, *Sudama Singh & Ors. vs. Government of Delhi and Another* reported in *2010 168 DLT 218* and *Orissa Mining Corporation vs.*

The Ministry of Environment & Forest reported in (2013) 6 SCC 476 to contend that long settled occupation cannot be displaced without due regard to their livelihood, habitation and rehabilitation right.

94. In our opinion, it requires a balancing of two Constitutional imperatives: on the one hand, the State's obligation to arrest the indiscriminate diversion of forest land and ensure that such lands are preserved in the public interest, and, on the other hand, the right under Article 21.
95. *Olga Tellis (supra)* recognised the importance of livelihood and procedural fairness but did not hold that long occupation of public land matures into a legal right or immunises an encroachment from removal in accordance with law.

At the same time, the Legislative scheme of the Conservation Act, 1980, makes it abundantly clear that the forest land cannot be diverted for non-forest purposes, nor can rights inconsistent with its protected status be recognised, except in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law.

96. Likewise, *Sudama Singh (supra)* was rendered in the context of urban settlements and emphasised the need to consider rehabilitation before eviction. The decision does not lay down that rehabilitation concerns can override statutory restrictions governing reserve forest or create proprietary rights where none otherwise exist.
97. The decision in *Orissa Mining Corporation (supra)* concerns rights claimed under the Forest Rights Act, 2006 and the requirement that such claims be examined through a statutory process. The judgment does not extend protection to every occupant of forest land, irrespective of eligibility under the Act, 2006.

As recorded hereinabove, the appellants have failed to demonstrate recognition of any right under the Forest Rights Act, 2006.

98. These decisions undoubtedly emphasised fairness and rehabilitation where applicable, and protection of rights recognised by law. None of them, however, supports the proposition that long occupation of reserved forest land without there being any legally recognised right can defeat the statutory and Constitutional obligation to protect the

forest.

We therefore find the reliance placed on the said authorities misplaced.

99. While having determined so, we are not oblivious to the fact that many of the appellants claim to have lived in the concerned areas for several decades and that eviction may entail hardship for them and their families. The materials on record also indicate that some settlements have existed for long periods and that civic facilities have gradually been extended to such areas.
100. These considerations undoubtedly call for sensitivity and human governance. However, even genuine hardship cannot by itself create a legal right over reserved forest land where none exists.
101. Courts are concerned with adjudicating rights recognised by law and cannot confer proprietary interest in reserved forest land merely on equitable considerations.
- At the same time, the existence or absence of a legal right does not preclude the executive from considering rehabilitation measures in appropriate cases.
- Questions relating to location, rehabilitation or formulation of suitable policy lie primarily within the domain of government, subject to Constitutional and Statutory limitations.
102. Therefore, while approving the course of action provided by the learned Single Judge as regards rehabilitation, we clarify that the dismissal of the appellant's claim to remain in occupation of the Reserved Forest shall not be construed as preventing the State from extending the benefit of any rehabilitation policy, scheme or executive decision that may otherwise apply to any eligible person.
103. For the foregoing discussions and reasons, all the appeals are accordingly dismissed.
104. The common judgment and order dated 08.06.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge is affirmed, albeit for the reasons recorded hereinabove.

Impugned Speaking Orders passed by the competitive authorities are upheld.

However, for ends of justice, and taking note of the ensuing monsoon season in the state

of Assam, the time limit provided by the learned single judge is **extended to 45** days from today.

105. There shall be no order as to costs.
106. While parting with records, it is provided that, if any policy or scheme of rehabilitation, relocation or assistance framed by the competent government is otherwise applicable to any individual appellant, it shall be open to such persons to seek consideration thereunder, and competent authorities may examine such claims on their own merits in accordance with the governing policy and law.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Comparing Assistant