



Serial No.27
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 3 of 2025

Date of Decision: 23.10.2025

Smti. Teldaris Nongbri,
D/o Phrida Nongbri.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. State of Meghalaya represented by the
Sub-Divisional School Education Officer,
East Khasi Hills District,
Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The Director of School Education and Literacy,
Government of Meghalaya,
East Khasi Hills District,
Shillong, Meghalaya.
3. Shri. Propphestar Shylla,
Head Teacher of Laitnongkseh,
L.P.School, P.O.Sohiong,
Shillong, East Khasi Hills District,
Meghalaya.
4. School Managing Committee,
Laitnongkseh L.P.School,
P.O.Sohiong, East Khasi Hills District,
Meghalaya.



5. Shri. Sarborlang Sawkmie,
Resident of Laitnongkseh,
P.O.Sohiong, East Khasi Hills District,
Meghalaya.
(Newly impleaded as respondent No. 5 vide
order dated 20-05-2025, passed in
MC[WP(C)]. No. 79 of 2025.)

...Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.S.Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Ms. S.Nongsiej, LAC.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. K.P.Bhattacharjee, GA
Ms. S.Shyam, GA for R 1 & 2.
Ms. B.Sun, Adv. for R 3 & 4.
Ms. P.Chettri, Adv. for R 5.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in
Law journals etc: | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether approved for publication
in press: | Yes/No |
-

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Ms. S. Nongsiej, learned LAC on behalf of the petitioner, today submits that the petitioner is willing to withdraw the instant writ petition, but however, she may be allowed to firstly continue to voluntarily serve the school and that in the event she obtains her MTET Certification, that she be considered for selection to the post that is vacant in the said school.



2. Ms. B.Sun, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 3 & 4, has vehemently objected to this submission, and submits that the school is not willing to accept her voluntary services as she has been working without any formal appointment orders and without any payment.

3. Mr. K.P.Bhattacharjee, learned GA appearing for the respondents No. 1 & 2, has submitted that the matter is basically between the writ petitioner and the Managing Committee, but however, he submits that to the knowledge of the State respondents, there has been no official appointment or any recommendation in favour of the writ petitioner.

4. Ms. P.Chettri, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 5, has however, made submissions in support of the writ petitioner, and submits that the respondent No. 5 had made a recommendation which however, was not carried through by the present Managing Committee, which is denied by Ms. B.Sun, learned counsel for the present Managing Committee, respondents No. 3 & 4.

5. In the backdrop of these circumstances, this Court firstly notes the fact that the petitioner, though may have been made a teachers' representative, was working without any formal orders of appointment, and as such, has not been vested with any right to agitate for any teachers post or to continue teaching in the school. On the other aspect, as she is pursuing the MTET Certification, it will naturally be open for her to apply for the



vacant post as and when she obtains the requisite qualification. As the school is not willing to accept the voluntary services of the writ petitioner, this Court cannot compel the respondents No. 3 & 4 to accept her services at this stage.

6. There being nothing left to consider, in terms of the observations made hereinabove, the writ petition accordingly stands closed and disposed of.

Judge