



Serial No.04
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

MC(Review Pet). No. 5 of 2025

Date of Decision: 11.11.2025

Shri. Ranjeng G. Sangma,
S/o. Lt. Ronjen Marak.

...Applicant

-Versus-

1. The Garo Hills Autonomous District Council,
Represented by the Secretary, Tura.
2. The Chief Executive Member,
Garo Hills Autonomous District Council,
Tura.
3. The Executive Member,
In-charge Revenue etc,
Garo Hills Autonomous District Council.
4. Shri. Natje Ch. Marak,
Nokma Jelbongpara Akhing,
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya.
5. Smti. Santira Ch. Marak,
Nokma of Jelbongpara Akhing,
W/o. Shri. Donald Ch. Sangma,
R/o. Jelbongpara, P.S.Ampati,
District South West Garo Hills District,
Meghalaya.
6. Shri. Donald Ch. Sangma,
H/o. Santira Ch. Marak,
R/o. Jelbongpara, P.S.Ampati,
District South West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya.



7. Shri. Emarson Ch. Marak,
S/o. Lt. Dingka Ch. Sangma,
R/o Jelbongpara, P.S.Ampati,
District South West Garo Hills,
Meghalaya.

...Respondents

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. P.T.Sangma, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. S.Dey, SC for R 1-3.
Mr. S.A.Shiekh, Adv. for R 4.
Mr. Philemon Nongbri, Adv. for R 5-7.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| 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 is an application for condonation of 341 days delay in preferring the review application against the order dated 20-06-2024, passed in WP(C). No. 173 of 2024. The grounds as set out in the application are that the writ petition had been dismissed as a document dated 20-11-1926, which had been relied upon in the impugned order of the Chief Executive Member, Garo Hills Autonomous District Council does not exist.



2. Mr. P.T.Sangma, learned counsel for the applicant submits that on coming to learn that the said document is not in existence, this review application has been filed and the delay caused is not attributable to the review petitioner, as the Court was on winter vacation. He therefore, prays that the delay in preferring the review application be condoned.

3. Mr. S.Dey, learned counsel for the respondents No. 1-3 GHADC, has objected to the prayer for condonation and submits that the ground taken for preferring the review application itself is untenable, inasmuch as, the review petitioner has never even bothered to apply for the document dated 20-11-1926, which is very much in the custody of the respondents No. 1-3 GHADC.

4. Mr. Philemon Nongbri, learned counsel for the respondents No. 5, 6 & 7, has referred to the affidavit filed by the said respondents, wherein the said document dated 20-11-1926, has been annexed. He submits that there is nothing left to consider in this application as the said document exists, and the condonation application is to be rejected.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, it appears that an examination of the review application is necessary in view of the submissions and facts that have been put before this Court.



6. Accordingly, the delay of 341 days is condoned. Registry to diarise the review application.

7. Misc. case stands closed and disposed of.

Judge