



Serial No. 09
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 95 of 2021

Date of Decision: 03.04.2025

ABC/289

Shri. Meytush Ch. Sangma (Dismissed)
Police Reserve Complex, Shillong – 01,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.

.....Petitioner

- Vs-

1. The State of Meghalaya represented by the
Chief Secretary to the Government of
Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The State of Meghalaya represented by the
Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya,
Home (Police) Department,
Shillong.
3. The Director General of Police,
Meghalaya, Shillong.
4. The Superintendent of Police,
East Khasi Hills District,
Shillong, Meghalaya.

..... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge



Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s)	:	Mr. S. Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. K. Khan, AAG with Mr. A.H. Kharwanlang, Addl.Sr.GA. Mr. S. Sengupta, Addl. Sr. GA.

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. Heard Mr. S. Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Also heard Mr. K. Khan, learned AAG assisted by Mr. A.H. Kharwanlang and Mr. S. Sengupta, learned Addl. Sr. GA for the State respondent.
3. In brief, the petitioner is aggrieved with the disciplinary proceedings instituted against him for alleged misconduct or misdemeanor on his part as far as his service is concerned. It is to be noted that the petitioner is a police personnel serving in the Meghalaya Police in the rank of Constable. Being aggrieved with the proceedings conducted as far as the departmental proceedings is concerned, his grievance is also directed to the contents and implication found in the Memorandum dated 18th November, 2020 issued by the Superintendent of Police & Disciplinary and Punishing Authority, East Khasi Hills, Shillong.



4. At the interjection of Mr. K. Khan, learned AAG, what has been pointed out is that in the last para of the said Memorandum (supra), the petitioner has been given an opportunity for making representation on the penalty proposed, however, this was not done so by the petitioner. In fact, the learned AAG has gone on to concede that, if the petitioner is indeed aggrieved by the entire proceedings or part of such proceedings, he is at liberty to make relevant representation before the concerned authority which will be disposed of in due course in accordance with the relevant laws and rules.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner, on such concession being given, is agreeable to make such representation before the concerned authority and has sought for 2(two) weeks' time from this Court to do so.

6. Without going into the merits of this instant petition, on the submission of the learned counsel for the respective parties, this petition is hereby disposed of on the following terms:

- i) That the petitioner should make a representation before the concerned authority pointing out his grievances as far as the requirement of the said Memorandum dated 18th November, 2020 is concerned, and further, he is also free



to raise any other issues which according to him are relevant. The said representation to be made within 2(two) weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order;

- ii) On receipt of such representation, the relevant authorities are directed to take up the case of the petitioner even, if it requires institution of fresh disciplinary proceedings, however, the same to be concluded within 3(three) months from the date of receipt of the representation of the petitioner; and
- iii) That due procedure including the principles of natural justice to be adhered to by the relevant authorities in this regard.

7. In view of the above, this petition is accordingly disposed of.

No costs.

Judge