Dean, Students' Welfare
अरुणाचल प्रदेश विश्वविद्यालय
ARUNACHAL PRADESH UNIVERSITY
(A State University Established on 1 July 2022 under the Arunachal Pradesh University Act, 2012)
HILL TOP, PASIGHAT – 791103
EAST SIANG DISTRICT, ARUNACHAL PRADESH, INDIA

NO. APU/DSW/ELECT/2026-15 Dated Pasighat, 17th Nov. 2026

HEARING OF THE GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL CELL OF APUSU ELECTION-2026

MINUTES

The Grievance Redressal Cell (GRC) constituted for APUSU Election-2026 convened a hearing on 15th November, 2026, at 10:00 AM in the Office of the Dean, Students' Welfare (DSW), Arunachal Pradesh University, to examine the written grievances received from students concerning various issues relating to the election process.

The following members of the Grievance Redressal Cell were present:

1. **Dr. Eli Doye**, Dean, Students' Welfare (DSW) – Chairperson, GRC, APUSU Election-2026.
2. **Shri Makbul Siram**, AC, DC Office, Pasighat – Member (Senior Administrative Officer).
3. **Dr. Fames Linggi**, Associate Professor – Member (Senior Faculty).
4. **Shri Nabam Chagrum**, MA III Semester – Member (Students' Representative).
5. **Ms. Rinjin Chomu Podo**, MA III Semester – Member (Students' Representative).

Receipt of Grievances

The Grievance Redressal Cell received ten (10) written complaints on 14th November, 2026, from the following students:

1. Bili Gadi, MA 1st Semester, Department of Education.
2. Dang Tajum Gusar, MA 1st Semester, Department of Economics.
3. Kerak Bagbi, MA 3rd Semester, Department of Economics.
4. Titi Naji, M. Com 1st Semester, Department of Commerce.
5. Bilom Taga, MA 1st Semester, Department of Education.
6. Atung Loffa, MA 1st Semester, Department of English.
7. Mary Panyang, MA 3rd Semester, Department of Hindi.
8. Neyi Appun Pertin, MA 1st Semester, Department of Sociology.
9. Manthung Hacheng, M.Sc 1st Semester, Department of Science.
10. Lamyi Nguba, MA 3rd Semester, Department of Tribal Studies.

Procedure adopted by the GRC

In accordance with Clause 6.8.6 of the Lyngdoh Committee Recommendations, the GRC separately heard the complainants and the concerned persons associated with the election process, including representatives of the Election Committee and Heads of the concerned Departments.
The Cell examined the grievances, sought relevant explanations and clarifications, and recorded the respective submissions, objections and responses. The members also examined the available nomination papers and supporting documents placed before them.

After considering the submissions and materials available on record, the GRC made the following observations and findings:

PROCEEDINGS, SUBMISSIONS AND FINDINGS

A. CLARIFICATIONS FROM THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND ELECTION COMMITTEE

1. Prof. P.C. Jena, Head, Department of Education

The Head of the Department stated that the attendance certificate had been furnished to the concerned candidate well in advance of the submission of the nomination form. He further clarified that the cumulative attendance statement of the Department had been prepared on 13th November, 2026.

2. Dr. Fames Linggi, Head, Department of Economics

The Head of the Department clarified that the cumulative attendance percentage of the Department had been compiled and finalised on 11th November, 2026, after the completion of the classes scheduled for that day.

The attendance certificates of Mr. Kerak Bagbi (MA 3rd Semester) and Mr. Dang Tajum Gusar (MA 1st Semester) were furnished on 12th November, 2026, whereas the last date for submission of nomination papers was 13th November, 2026, up to 12:00 Noon.

Accordingly, the Head of the Department stated that the allegation of delay in submission of nomination papers on account of non-availability of attendance certificates was unfounded.

3. Dr. Chiging Yamang, Head i/c, Department of Commerce

The Head i/c of the Department clarified that the attendance certificate had been prepared and furnished to the concerned candidate by 11:10 AM on 13th November, 2026.

4. Election Committee, led by Dr. Rajen Miwu, Returning Officer, APUSU Election-2026

The Returning Officer and the Election Committee furnished the following explanations:

a. In respect of Mr. Bilom Taga:

- The nomination form did not bear the signatures of the proposer and seconder.
- Owing to space constraints in the election room, only the candidate was permitted to enter the room for submission and signing of the nomination form.
- The Election Committee stated that repeated announcements had been made informing candidates about the submission requirements.
- The nomination form clearly stipulated that the proposer and seconder were required to append their signatures before submission.

b. In respect of Ms. Neyi Appun Pertin and Ms. Mary Panyang:

- The Election Committee stated that the No Objection Certificates (NOCs) submitted by both candidates were not found to be genuine and authentic.
- The offices of the Officer-in-Charge (OC) and Superintendent of Police (SP) were reportedly contacted to verify the issuance of the NOCs.
- According to the Election Committee, no corresponding record of issuance could be established.

c. In respect of Ms. Titi Naji:

The Election Committee clarified that the candidate had been disqualified on account of non-submission of the required affidavit and not on the ground of non-submission of an attendance certificate.

d. In respect of Mr. Atung Loffa:

The Election Committee stated that the required original affidavit was not found in the nomination papers submitted by the candidate.

e. In respect of Mr. Manthung Hacheng:

The Election Committee acknowledged that the original affidavit was found and that the candidate was eligible to contest the post of Class Representative (CR).

f. In respect of Mr. Lamyi Nguba:

The Election Committee stated that the grievance raised by the candidate was outside the purview of the Election Committee's consideration as presented before the GRC.

B. INDIVIDUAL GRIEVANCES AND FINDINGS OF THE GRC

5. Mr. Bili Gadi

Grievance:

The complainant alleged that the Department had not prepared his attendance statement by 11:00 AM. He further stated that his attendance was subsequently recalculated and the corrected attendance figure was furnished in his nomination papers only at 11:40 AM, resulting in delay and his inability to submit the nomination paper within the stipulated time.

Finding:

The Department of Education confirmed that the attendance certificate had been furnished well before the prescribed deadline. The allegation of delay attributable to the Department was, therefore, not substantiated by the clarification furnished by the Department.

6. Mr. Kerak Bagbi

Grievance:

The complainant stated that the submission of his nomination paper was delayed because he was engaged in campaigning and election-related activities in the Department of Commerce in support of other candidates.

Finding:

The Department of Economics confirmed that his attendance certificate had been furnished on 12th November, 2026. The candidate also acknowledged having received the attendance certificate on the same date. The GRC, therefore, did not find sufficient grounds to attribute the delay in submission of his nomination paper to the Department.

7. Mr. Dang Tajum Gusar

Grievance:

The complainant stated that he could not submit his nomination paper within the stipulated time because the document was in the possession of another person at the time of submission.

Finding:

The Department of Economics confirmed that his attendance certificate had been furnished on 12th November, 2026. The candidate also acknowledged receipt of the certificate on the same date. Accordingly, the GRC did not find sufficient grounds to attribute his failure to submit the nomination paper to any delay on the part of the Department.

8. Ms. Titi Naji

Grievance:

The complainant stated that she could not collect her affidavit within the prescribed time because she was attending classes in an attempt to improve her attendance and address the shortage thereof.

Finding:

The Department of Commerce confirmed that the attendance certificate had been furnished well before the prescribed deadline. The Election Committee, however, clarified that her disqualification was on account of non-submission of the required affidavit and not due to the attendance certificate. The GRC did not find sufficient grounds to recommend reconsideration of her grievance.

9. Mr. Lamyi Nguba

Grievance:

The complainant stated that he could not collect both the affidavit and NOC due to insufficient time, as the requirement of these documents had not been adequately notified in advance by the Election

Committee. He further contended that several candidates were unable to submit their nomination papers due to a lack of prior information regarding the required documents.

Finding:

The GRC observed that other candidates had managed to collect and submit the prescribed documents and qualify to contest for the post of Class Representative. In view of the available information, the GRC did not find sufficient grounds to recommend reconsideration of the candidate's grievance.

10. Mr. Manthung Hacheng

Grievance:

The complainant maintained that he had enclosed his original affidavit along with his nomination paper and that the document might have been misplaced or detached from the nomination file.

Finding:

Upon examination of the relevant file, the GRC members were able to trace the original affidavit, which was found to have been placed separately from the nomination paper. Since the original affidavit was available in the candidate's file, the GRC found merit in the candidate's submission and recommended that the Returning Officer and Election Committee reconsider his candidature for the post of Class Representative.

11. Mr. Atung Loffa

Grievance:

The complainant insisted that he had submitted his original affidavit along with his nomination paper and produced a photocopy of the affidavit in support of his claim.

Finding:

The GRC could not locate the original affidavit in the nomination paper or the relevant file. The photocopy produced by the candidate did not, by itself, establish that the original affidavit had been submitted along with the nomination paper. Accordingly, the GRC did not find sufficient grounds to accept the allegation that the original affidavit had been misplaced or detached by the Election Committee.

12. Ms. Neyi Appun Pertin

Grievance:

The complainant produced an original NOC before the GRC and requested that it be accepted for consideration of her candidature. However, the original NOC produced before the GRC was different from the photocopy of the NOC enclosed with her nomination paper.

Finding:

Upon examination, the GRC observed that the photocopy of the NOC submitted with the nomination paper differed from the original NOC subsequently produced before the Cell. The signatures appearing on the two documents did not tally. Further, the original corresponding to the photocopy enclosed with the nomination paper could not be produced before the GRC.

In view of these discrepancies, the GRC recommends the Competent Authority to allow the candidate to bring the original copy of the photocopy which she had attached with Nomination paper or any Confirmation letter regarding her submitted document from the SP, Upper Siang District.

13. Ms. Mary Panyang

Grievance:

The complainant produced an original NOC before the GRC and requested that it be accepted for consideration of her candidature. However, the original NOC produced before the GRC was different from the photocopy of the NOC enclosed with her nomination paper.

Finding:

Upon examination, the GRC observed that the photocopy of the NOC submitted with the nomination paper differed from the original NOC subsequently produced before the Cell. The signatures appearing on the two documents did not tally. Further, the original corresponding to the photocopy enclosed with the nomination paper could not be produced before the GRC.

In view of these discrepancies, the GRC recommends the Competent Authority to allow the candidate to bring the original copy of the photocopy which she had attached with Nomination paper or any Confirmation letter regarding her submitted document from the SP, Upper Siang District.

14. Mr. Bilom Taga
Grievance:

The complainant alleged that the Election Committee had not permitted his proposer and seconder to enter the Election Hall at the time of submission of his nomination paper, although their presence had been indicated in the Election Notification Order. He contended that this prevented them from signing his nomination paper. He cited Point 4 of the Note given in the Election Notification as his strong point of argument.

Finding:

The GRC noted the Election Committee's explanation that, owing to space constraints, only contesting candidates were permitted to enter the election room to file/submit their nomination paper.

While the GRC took note of the possibility of congestion, haste and confusion at the time of submission, particularly when candidates approached the Election Committee towards the last moment, it did not find sufficient grounds to recommend reconsideration of the complainant's grievance.

According to the above grievance as specified in Point 4 of the Note given in the Election Notification, the candidate must be accompanied by the proposer and the seconder during the submission/filing of Nomination paper. However, as per the explanation given by Election Committee, they have locked the room and didn't allow the proposer and the seconder to accompany the candidate. As a result, their signatures could not append in the candidate's nomination paper.

Hence, the GRC recommends the Competent Authority to consider the candidature of Mr. Bilom Taga for the post of Class Representative.

C. FINAL FINDINGS, DECISION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRC

After examining the grievances, hearing the concerned complainants and representatives of the Election Committee, obtaining clarifications from the concerned Heads of Departments, and considering the available documents and materials placed before it, the Grievance Redressal Cell arrived at the following conclusions:

1. The grievance of **Mr. Manthung Hacheng** was found to have merit, as his original affidavit was traced from his file during the hearing. Accordingly, the GRC recommended that the Returning Officer and Election Committee reconsider his candidature for the post of Class Representative.
2. The grievance of **Ms. Neyi Appun Pertin** is recommended to the Competent Authority to allow the candidate to bring the original copy of the photocopy which she had attached with Nomination paper or any Confirmation letter regarding her submitted document from the SP, Upper Siang District and to consider her candidature upon fulfilment of the condition as stated above.
3. The grievance of **Ms. Mary Panyang** is also recommended to the Competent Authority to allow the candidate to bring the original copy of the photocopy which she had attached with Nomination paper or any Confirmation letter regarding her submitted document from the SP, Upper Siang District, and to consider her candidature upon fulfilment of the condition as stated above.
4. The GRC also recommends the grievance of **Mr. Bilom Taga** to the Competent Authority to consider the candidature for the post of Class Representative.
5. In respect of the remaining complainants, namely, **Mr. Bili Gadi, Mr. Dang Tajum Gusar, Mr. Kerak Bagbi, Ms. Titi Naji, Mr. Atung Loffa, and Mr. Lamyi Nguba**, the GRC did not find sufficient grounds, on the basis of the submissions and materials available before it, to recommend reconsideration of their respective grievances.

The GRC further observed that any complainant who remains dissatisfied with the findings or recommendations of the Cell shall be at liberty to approach the competent institutional authority,

including the Vice-Chancellor, for appropriate consideration and further redressal in accordance with the applicable rules and procedures.

D. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. During the hearing, the GRC observed certain instances of unruly and inappropriate behaviour of some students of the University. Such developments raise concerns regarding the maintenance of a peaceful, orderly and conducive atmosphere during the forthcoming APUSU Election-2026.
2. The Cell also took note of information received from various sources indicating the possibility of external pressure and interference in the election process. While these matters require appropriate verification, the GRC considers them serious concerns that should not be overlooked.
3. The Election Committee and the University administration take appropriate preventive measures to ensure a peaceful, free and fair election environment.
4. Unauthorised persons and individuals having no legitimate role in the election process be discouraged from interfering in election-related activities.
5. Candidates, supporters and other stakeholders maintain discipline, decorum and mutual respect throughout the election process.
6. The Election Committee ensure clear communication of election procedures, eligibility requirements, documentary requirements and submission deadlines to all prospective candidates.

E. CONCLUSION

The hearing concluded after due consideration of the grievances and clarifications placed before the Grievance Redressal Cell.

These minutes are prepared to place on record the proceedings, submissions, observations, findings and recommendations of the GRC for information and necessary action by the competent University authorities.

(Dr. Eli Doye)
Chairperson

(Shri Makbul Siram)
Member

17/11/2026
(Dr. Fames Linggi)
Member

(Mr. Nabam Chagrum)
Member (Students' Representative)

(Ms. Rinjin Chomu Podo)
Member (Students' Representative)

NO. APU/DSW/ELECT/2026-15 Dated Pasighat, 17th Nov. 2026

Copy to:

1. PA to the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor, APU, Pasighat for information.
2. PA to the Registrar, APU, Pasighat for information.
3. The Returning Officer, APUSU Election-2026 for information.
4. All Complainants for information.
5. Office copy.

(Dr. Eli Doye)
Chairperson

(Shri Makbul Siram)
Member

(Dr. Fames Linggi)
Member

(Mr. Nabam Chagrum)
Member (Students' Representative)

(Ms. Rinjin Chomu Podo)
Member (Students' Representative)