



Serial No.01
Daily List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WA No.73/2025

Date of Judgment: 01.12.2025

BNC/534 Dhononjoy Hajong

..... Appellant

Vs.

1. The State of Meghalaya represented by the Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Meghalaya.

2. The State of Meghalaya represented by the Secretary to the Govt. of Meghalaya, Home (Police) Department.

3. Commandant 6th Battalion, Meghalaya Police Umran, Ri-Bhoi District, Meghalaya. Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Soumen Sen, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Appearance:

For the Appellant : Mr. A. Singh, Adv

For the Respondents : Mr. K.P. Bhattacharjee, GA

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| 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)

This appeal arises out of a judgment and order passed on 22.10.2024 in a writ petition in which a challenge is thrown to the decision of the respondent authorities in discharging the writ petitioner from the post of Constable.

2. Briefly stated, the writ petitioner claims himself to be a Constable posted in the year 2010 and he was issued with a provisional appointment letter on 16.11.2021 after he brought to the notice of the



respondent authorities that his name had been misspelt. The authorities concerned issued a provisional appointment letter and required the writ petitioner to produce relevant documents in support of his claim. The writ petitioner had claimed to have lost the Admit Card and also could not verify the Roll Number to ascertain the correctness of his name, as appearing in the Admit Card vis-à-vis the person, namely ‘Dhananjoy’ instead of ‘Dhononjoy’ which appears to be the basis for the claim of the State respondents of impersonation by the writ petitioner.

3. Curiously, the writ petitioner was unable to produce the Admit Card and he claimed that the said Admit Card was lost, for which he could not verify the Roll Number to ascertain the correctness of the name. The writ petitioner has not lodged any general diary or brought it to the notice of the authorities concerned contemporaneously when the said discrepancy surfaced or even thereafter. Two show cause notices were issued and it appears that enough opportunity was given to the writ petitioner to defend himself and produce materials in his defence. One of the most glaring facts is that the selected candidate’s Roll Number was 8584, whereas the writ petitioner’s Roll Number was 33003. The learned single judge has ascertained and verified such facts from the documents annexed to the affidavit filed by the State and has specifically referred to Annexure-4 at relevant page 32, Sl. No.68 of the



affidavit, which disclosed the name of the writ petitioner as ‘Dhananjoy Hajong’ instead of ‘Dhononjoy Hajong’.

4. The learned counsel for the writ petitioner has strenuously argued that there are serious flaws in the departmental proceedings both substantial and procedural. Even if we accept that there has been any procedural breaches, we could not find any satisfactory answer for the alleged loss of the Admit Card and the fact that the selected candidate’s Roll Number was 8584 whereas, the writ petitioner’s Roll Number was 33003 and on the basis of the Roll Number 8584, the writ petitioner could secure the employment by taking advantage of the discrepancy of the vowels mentioned in the first name of the candidate namely, ‘a’ and ‘o’.

5. In view thereof, we do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order passed by the learned single judge.

6. The appeal fails and is hereby dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs

(W. Diengdoh)
Judge

(Soumen Sen)
Chief Justice