



Serial No. 01
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 246 of 2025

Date of Decision: 23.06.2025

Sri. Subodh Kumar Rai

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. Union of India represented by
 The Commandant, Group Centre,
 Central Reserve Police Force,
 9th Mile Amerigog, Guwahati,
 Dist. Kamrup-781023

... Respondent(s)

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. P.K. Borah, Adv.

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

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. The petitioner in the instant case was appointed to the post of Constable Bugler in CRPF, and as per the submission of the learned counsel, the petitioner had reported for training on



28.01.2025, and was inducted into the training programme. Thereafter, on 14.04.2025, the petitioner had applied for 2(two) days' leave and on returning back, the appointment of the petitioner was cancelled vide order dated 08.04.2025, on the ground that he had never reported for duty to the Group Centre on 22.02.2025, as directed.

2. Mr. P.K. Borah, learned counsel for the petitioner had submitted that though the appointment order had been issued by the office of the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Group Centre, CRPF, Guwahati (Assam) 9th Mile Amerigog, Distt-Kamrup, and though the petitioner had reported for duty in the Group Centre, Jorabat at Guwahati, he being a resident of Meghalaya the writ petition would be maintainable before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution. In support of his submissions, the learned counsel has placed reliance in the case of *Shrigovind Niranjana vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh* reported in *Neutral Citation No. 2024: MPHC-JBP: 56995*, and has submitted that in the cited case the petitioner therein though a resident of Bhopal had preferred a writ petition in the Principal seat in the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur. Though objections were raised with regard to territorial jurisdiction of the Bench, he submits it was held that the Principle of Forum



Conveniens has to be tested from the stand point of the petitioner who is the dominus litis and not at the conveniences of the State Government. He therefore, submits that the writ petitioner being a resident of Meghalaya, though the appointment order may have been issued in Guwahati and had reported for duty in the Group Centre at Guwahati itself, the writ petition is maintainable before this High Court.

3. Dr. N. Mozika, learned DSGI assisted by Ms. M. Myrchiang, learned counsel for the respondent has refuted the submission and has submitted that none of the cause of action has arisen in Meghalaya, and even the principle laid down in the judgment so placed will have no application as it refers to the conveniences of the State Government. In the instant case, as the appointment order had been issued by the Group Centre CRPF at Guwahati, as such he submits the writ petition is not maintainable.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials, it is seen that the appointment order was issued from the Group Centre, 9th Mile Guwahati, and the writ petitioner after allegedly joining was also serving there and attached as an Orderly to the Deputy Commandant, and even the cancellation of the



appointment for the post of Constable has been issued from the Group Centre itself.

5. In the entire chain of events apart from the fact that the writ petitioner being a resident of Meghalaya, no other materials are there to support that this Court has jurisdiction over the instant matter. Accordingly, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the jurisdictional High Court.

6. The matter stands closed and disposed of.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
23.06.2025
"V. Lyndem-PS"