



Serial No.30
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 258 of 2024

Date of Decision: 18.08.2025

Saiful Islam,
S/o Late Hussain Ali.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. State of Meghalaya represented by
Chief Secretary.
2. Commissioner & Secretary,
Department of Community and Rural Development,
Govt. of Meghalaya.
3. Mission Director,
State Rural Employment Society (MGNREGS),
Meghalaya.
4. Deputy Commissioner,
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya.
5. Project Director,
DRDA, West Gario Hills, Meghalaya.
6. Block Development Officer,
Selsella C&RD Block,
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya.
7. Chairman, Village Employment Council,
Lalmati Village, Selsella C&RD Block,
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya.



8. Secretary, Village Employment Council,
Lalmati Village, Selsella C&RD Block,
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya.
9. Women Member,
Village Employment Council,
Lalmati Village, Selsella C&RD Block,
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya.

...Respondents

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. N.M.Mansuri, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. R.Colney, GA and
Mr. A.M.Pala, GA for R 1-6.
Mr. S.A.Shiekh, Adv. and
Mr. M.R.Marak, Adv. for R 7-9.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| 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. This case is yet another matter, whereby election or selection to the Village Employment Council (VEC) has been challenged by the writ petitioner. It has been alleged in the writ petition that the petitioner and 123



others have been deprived of the right to take part in the election to the VEC of Lalmati Village, Selsella C&RD Block.

2. Mr. N.M.Mansuri, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that in the selection of the VEC that was conducted on 18-11-2023, the writ petitioner and the complainants were not informed about any meeting nor were they allowed to vote or tender their candidature thereto. It is submitted that the State respondents have mechanically approved the selection of the VEC and as this has infringed upon their rights, learned counsel prays that directions be issued to conduct fresh elections, wherein the writ petitioner can take part in.

3. Ms. R.Colney, learned GA appearing for the respondents No. 1-6, in reply, has drawn the attention of this Court to the affidavit filed by the State respondents, and submits that the approval was granted as the attendance sheet records of the meeting had the signatures and thumb impressions of 142 participants in the meeting out of 224 job card holders, which indicates that it is not a fact that the job card holders were not aware about the conduct of the said meeting. It is further submitted that from the 123 complainants itself, 56 of the signatories were present in the said meeting, and further, with regard to the complaint against the constitution of the VEC, 15 numbers of signatories who appeared in the complaint have retracted the same and



have by a letter dated 09-08-2024, accused the writ petitioner of misusing the same. She therefore, submits that the writ petition being without any basis and with no substance, does not deserve any consideration by this Court.

4. Mr. S.A.Shiekh, learned counsel appearing for the respondents No. 7, 8 & 9, has endorsed the submissions made by the learned GA and submits that apart from only seeking fresh elections, the writ petitioner has not even impugned the order granting approval of the duly constituted VEC. He therefore, prays that the writ petition being without any merits, deserves to be dismissed in limine.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and also perused the materials on record. The prayer of the writ petitioner as observed earlier, is only limited to seeking directions for holding of fresh elections to allow the writ petitioner to participate. The foundation of the writ petitioner's entire case appears to be on an assertion that there was no notice of any meeting to select the VEC, and further, that the process adopted at the meeting was not in consonance or as per procedure prescribed in the voting for such matters. However, what is notable is that there is no categorical denial to the statements that have been made in the affidavit, wherein it is stated that the job card holders names have been used or alleged to have been used fraudulently to project the case of the writ petitioner. Indeed, the VEC plays



a very important role and it is in the interest of all the job card holders to ensure that a competent and an efficient committee is elected by all the job card holders and put in place for the benefit of the entire community. What has been witnessed however, in a series of litigations which are before this Court, is on the election or approval of any VEC, writ petitions have been filed challenging the same on various grounds. It is to be remembered that at the level of the VEC, the job card holders or the village elders would be well advised that it is not a playground to play politics, but they should work together for the community.

6. Having observed as above, it is also to be kept in mind by the respondents that the election or selection of a VEC should be done in a free and fair manner with proper notice to all the job card holders to enable them to participate in a free and fair manner.

7. Accordingly, there being no merit in the instant writ petition, moreover, with the approval not ever being put to challenge, no interference is called for and the same without further observation or lingering with the matter any further, stands dismissed.

Judge