



Serial No. 01
Supplementary List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

MC(CRP) No. 18 of 2025 in
CRP. No. 9 of 2024

Date of Decision: 14.10.2025

Shri. Paul Leong,
 S/o (L) T.S. Leong,
 R/o Lower Mawprem, Shillong,
 East Khasi Hills District,
 Meghalaya.

..... Applicant

- Vs-

The Archdiocese of Shillong,
 R/o Laitumkhrah, Shillong,
 East Khasi Hills District,
 Meghalaya.

..... Opp. Party

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s)	:	Mr. K.Ch. Gautam, Adv. Mr. A. Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. S. Sen, Adv. Mr. M.U. Ahmed, 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. Heard Mr. K.Ch. Gautam, learned counsel for the applicant, who has submitted that there is a pending litigation before this Court between the parties, the same being CRP. No. 9 of 2024 concerning a suit property, a decree passed as regard the suit involving a property and the execution proceedings following such decree. The petitioner being aggrieved with the procedure carried out by the Trial Court and Execution Court, has approached this Court with relevant prayer.

2. The learned counsel has however submitted that, pending disposal of the said CRP. No. 9 of 2024, the Trial Court in Title Execution Case No. 2 (H) of 2017 passed an order dated 23.09.2025 in Misc. Case No. 49 (H) of 2023, directing for execution of the said decree. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that, if the impugned order is allowed to proceed, the whole purpose of the prayer made by the applicant as petitioner in the said CRP. No. 9 of 2024, would become futile, and in fact, the petition itself would become infructuous. It is therefore prayed that the relevant records be called for, and in the meantime, the said impugned order dated 23.09.2025 be stayed.

3. Per contra, Mr. S. Sen, learned counsel for the opposite party, has strongly objected to the prayer made, and has submitted that the course



of action taken up by the Trial Court has been carried out with due deference to the various orders passed by this Court, wherein there is practically no stay for execution of the said decree.

4. Be that as it may, the learned counsel has also impute delinquent conduct as far as the applicant/petitioner is concerned, to say that throughout these proceedings, he has made several attempts to stall the hearing of the petition. As such, no concession may be given to the applicant, rather the main petition may be taken up for hearing at the earliest.

5. This Court, on consideration of the submission made, without going into the merits of the matter, on a cursory glance at the impugned order, what is noticed is that the order was passed on 23.09.2025, whereby the bailiff was directed to remove all the goods and articles belonging to the judgment debtor/applicant herein from the suit premises. Incidentally, the date fixed for filing of the report by the bailiff is today i.e. 14.10.2025. On record, this Court is not aware of any report filed, nor the contents of such report is also known. In such a situation, to stay the operation of the said impugned order, may not be practical. Whatever the outcome, the parties are entitled to resort to legal remedies, if so desired.

6. Accordingly, this Misc. Case is found to be devoid of merits,



the same is hereby dismissed and stands disposed of.

Judge