



Serial No. 01
Daily List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WA No. 18 of 2025

Date of order: 11.11.2025

Managing Committee of Tillapara Girls S.S.A. L.P. School, Rajabala, West Garo Hills, Meghalaya represented herein by its Chairperson, Shri Anowar Ali, S/o Miyar Uddin Sk., R/o Village-Rajabala, P.O. & P.S. Rajabala, West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya.

...Appellant

- versus -

1. State of Meghalaya represented by the Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya, Education Department, Meghalaya.
2. Director of School Education and Literacy, Meghalaya, Shillong.
3. The State Project Director, SSA Meghalaya, Shillong.
4. The District Mission Coordinator, SSA West Garo Hills, Tura.
5. The Sub-Divisional School Education Officer/Jt. District Mission Coordinator, Dadenggre, West Garo Hills.
6. The Block Mission Coordinator SSA, Selsella, West Garo Hills.
7. Smti. Oleda Sheikh
8. Smti. Supiya Khatun

...Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Soumen Sen, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.S.Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Appellant : Mr S. Sen, Adv. with
Mr M.U. Ahmed, Adv.

For the Respondents : Mr K.P. Bhattacharjee, GA with
Ms S.Shyam, GA
Mr S.A. Sheikh, Adv. [for R8]



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

JUDGMENT: (per the Hon’ble, the Chief Justice) (Oral)

The writ appellant is a Managing Committee of the Tillapara Girls’ S.S.A. L.L. School represented by its Chairperson.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that there are few observations in the judgment which need to be expunged as it would create an adverse impression about the bona fide of the present writ appellant. The learned counsel has specifically referred to paragraph 38 of the impugned order and submitted that the said paragraph needs to be expunged for the reason that the observation of the learned single judge that the writ petitioner was appointed as Head Teacher on the basis of an advertisement floated in this regard it is an error apparent on the face of the record. If it were an error apparent on the face of the record, it would be open for the appellant to file an application for review limited to the issue raised in paragraph 38 that the Head Teacher was not appointed on the basis of the advertisement floated in this regard.

3. The other submission of the learned counsel for the appellant is that the observation of the learned single judge that the writ petitioner would be deemed to have been regularly appointed as Head Teacher in



the year 2001 is an inference drawn from facts and does not call for any correction. Moreover, we doubt the locus standi of the appellant in preferring an appeal against the said judgment. The appellant cannot be said to be a person aggrieved. The judgment is not merely based on the observation on which our attention has been drawn by the learned counsel for the appellant.

4. The appeal accordingly stands disposed of. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

(H.S.Thangkhiew)
Judge

(Soumen Sen)
Chief Justice