



**Serial No. 01**  
**Supplementary List**

**HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA**  
**AT SHILLONG**

WP(C) No. 99 of 2025

Date of Decision: 04.04.2025

Shri Samarjeet Kumar

.... **Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

1. Union of India represented by the  
Secretary to the Government of India,  
Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi
2. Director General of Assam Rifles  
Mahanideshalaya Assam Rifles  
Directorate General Assam Riles, Shillong
3. Additional D.G. Assam Rifles  
Mahanideshalaya Assam Rifles  
Directorate General Assam Riles, Shillong
4. Presiding Officer,  
Recruitment Branch/Cell, Dimapur
5. Presiding Officer,  
Recruitment Branch/Cell,  
Directorate General Assam Riles, Shillong
6. The Public Information Officer,  
Mahanideshalaya Assam Rifles  
Directorate General Assam Riles, Shillong
7. The Appellate Authority Assam Rifles, Shillong  
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.

... **Respondent(s)**




---

**Coram:**

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

---

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner(s) : Ms. P. Bhattacharjee, Adv. with  
Mr. Z.A. Choudhury, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Dr. N. Mozika, DSGI with  
Ms. M. Myrchiang, Adv.

---

|    |                                                        |        |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in<br>Law journals etc: | Yes/No |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|

|     |                                               |        |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|--------|
| ii) | Whether approved for publication<br>in press: | Yes/No |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|--------|

---

**(ORAL)**

1. Heard Ms. P. Bhattacharjee, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Dr. N. Mozika, learned DSGI assisted by Ms. M. Myrchiang, learned counsel is present and accepts notice on behalf of all the respondents, so no further notice is called for.

3. The prayer of the writ petitioner as projected in the writ petition is for production of the records related to a certain recruitment, wherein the petitioner had participated, and for further directions to compensate for the loss of the petitioner not getting selected.



4. Ms. P. Bhattacharjee, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner had taken part in the selection on 14.07.2011, pursuant to an advertisement for the trade of Barber, Clerk and ORL, in the Assam Rifles. She submits that due to certain discrepancies on the part of the selecting authority, the petitioner though qualifying initially in the Rally, and in the Written Test, was not selected. She further submits that after obtaining all the requisite papers, the petitioner has now come before this Court seeking relief as aforementioned.

5. Dr. N. Mozika, learned DSGI assisted by Ms. M. Myrchiang, learned counsel for the respondents at the outset has submitted that the writ petition is hopelessly barred by delay and laches, and the excuse given by the writ petitioner that the records could not be obtained is factually incorrect. The learned DSGI has referred to the order dated 13.02.2015 passed in WP(C) No. 250 of 2014, wherein this Court had directed the respondents to supply the requisite documents. He further submits that pursuant to this, on 19.02.2015, such documents were supplied to the petitioner. As such, he submits the writ petitioner having waived any rights that he might have possessed, by the long delay, the writ petition is liable to be not entertained.



6. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and also examined the materials on record, it is a fact that the reliefs sought by the writ petitioner in the present writ petition relates to a recruitment that took place on 14.07.2011, and that thereafter the petitioner had also filed a writ petition before this Court seeking for the records, for which the respondents had duly provided in the year 2015, itself.

7. It is not understood therefore, as to what had prevented the writ petitioner from approaching this Court at an earlier point of time. It appears that the petitioner has filed this writ petition just to try his luck, as to whether anything can be obtained.

8. In view of these facts and circumstances, in the view of this Court, the writ petition being barred by delay and laches, the same is not entertained and is summarily dismissed.

**JUDGE**

Meghalaya  
04.04.2025  
"V. Lyndem-PS"