



Serial No. 02
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

MC(Review Pet.) No. 1 of 2026

Date of Decision: 09.01.2026

1. Shri. Chesterfield Suja, Son of Kiang Pohsnem, Resident of Tynring, East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.
2. Smti. Marcyldha K. Sangma, Daughter of (L) Evan J. R. Sangma, Resident of New Tura, West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya.
3. Smti. Rosenylla Marbaniang, D/O (L) Sinoline Marbaniang Resident of Madan Laban East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.
4. Shri. Sonybirth G Momin, Son of (L) Hudgson N sangma, Resident of Ringregittim, Tura West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya.
5. Smti Alexandria M Sangma, Daughter of E.S. Marak, Resident of Lower Chandmari, Tura West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya.
6. Smti. Glory Pakyntein, Daughter of (L) W. Wahlang, Resident of Wahiajer, West Jaintia Hills District, Meghalaya.
7. Smti. Kyntiewlang Rymbai, Daughter of (L) P. Nongpluh, Resident of Ummulong, West Jaintia Hills District, Meghalaya.
8. Shri. Charnenko D. Sangma, Son of Slida D. Sangma, Resident of Tura, West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya.
9. Shri. Ioolangki Lakiang, Son of (L) B. Niangti, Resident of Dulong, Jowai West Jaintia Hills District, Meghalaya.

.....Applicants

-Versus-

1. The State of Meghalaya
Represented by the Director of Sericulture and Weaving Department
of Textiles, Meghalaya, Shillong.



2. The Principal Secretary to the Govt. of Meghalaya, Textiles Department, Shillong.
3. The Commissioner & Secretary to the Govt. of Meghalaya, Personnel Department, Shillong.
4. Shri. Lurmangkara Rympei, Sericulture Inspector, Office of District Sericulture Officer, Nongpoh, Ri-Bhoi District.
5. Smti. Iadalin Kharjana, Manager, Manager, Office of District Sericulture officer, Shillong, East Khasi Hills District.
6. Smti Nickchira Ch. Marak, Reeling Foreman, Office of District Sericulture officer, Resubelpara, North Garo Hills District.
7. Sh. Bashaibok Mawthoh, Sericulture Inspector, Office of the District Sericulture Officer, Jowai, West Jaintia Hills District.
8. Sh. Brilliant E.C. Palle, Reeling Foreman, Office of District Sericulture Officer, Jowai, West Jaintia Hills District.
9. Sh. Ashraful Alom, Sericulture Inspector, Office of District Sericulture Development officer, Tikrikilla, West Garo Hills District.
10. The Meghalaya Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Lachumiere, Shillong.

.....Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. Bhattacharjee, Judge

Appearance:

For the Appellant/Petitioner(s) : Dr. N. Mozika, Sr. Adv with
Mr. M.L. Nongpiur, Adv.
Ms. T. Sutnga, Adv.



For the Respondent(s) : Mr. A. Kumar, AG with
 Mr. S. Sengupta, Addl. Sr. GA
 Mr. K. P. Bhattacharjee, GA for R/1-3
 Mr. K. Paul, Sr. Adv with
 Mr. S. Chanda, Adv for R/10
 None for R/ 4-9

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in
Law journals etc.: | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether approved for publication
in press: | Yes/No |
-

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

Per W. Diengdoh, (J):

1. This is an application with a prayer for grant of leave to the applicants herein to prefer a review petition for review of the judgment and order dated 09.12.2025 passed by this Court in MC (WA) No. 90 of 2025 arising out of W.A. No. 77 of 2025.
2. Heard Dr. N. Mozika learned Sr. counsel along with Mr. M.L. Nongpiur for the applicants and Mr. A. Kumar, learned AG along with Mr. S. Sengupta, learned Addl. Sr. GA for the State respondents No.1, 2 and 3 respectively and also Mr. K. Paul, learned Sr. counsel along with Mr. S. Chanda, learned counsel for respondent No.10 (Meghalaya Public Service Commission).
3. It is the submission of the learned Sr. counsel for the applicants that the applicants herein were appointed as Farm Managers/ Inspector and



Reeling Foreman in the department of Textiles, Government of Meghalaya in the year 2008 – 2014 on officiating basis.

4. Along with the applicants herein, there are also 6 (six) other incumbents who are identically and similarly situated and these applicants have approached this Court by way of a writ petition being WP (C) No. 493 of 2022 with a prayer inter-alia, for issuance of advertisement for regularisation of their services by way of special recruitment as against the post they are occupying. This petition was disposed of vide order dated 05.09.2023 with a direction to the State respondent to consider the case of the writ petitioners as far as their regularisation is concerned.

5. In the meantime, the said petitioners in WP (C) No. 493 of 2022 has also filed a contempt petition before this Court alleging non-compliance of the Court's order. Before the said contempt case is disposed of, the State respondent has preferred an intra-court appeal against the said Order dated 05.09.2023. The said appeal was registered as WA No. 77 of 2025, the same being accompanied by another application being MC (WA) No. 90 of 2025 with a prayer for condonation of delay.

6. This Court in the division bench has disposed of both the application for condonation of delay and also the main appeal vide the said order dated 09.12.2025 (supra). In the order, at para 7 of the same, this Court has directed the State to expedite the process of finalising and publishing or draft advertisement within 2 (two) weeks from the date of the said order.

7. It is the further submission of the learned Sr. counsel that this Court in the division bench was not informed that the applicants herein had also filed a similar application as was filed by the petitioners in WP (C) No. 493



of 2022, before this Court being registered as WP (C) No. 555 of 2025 and that this Court in the single bench, had vide order dated 04.11.2025 passed an interim order directing that “.... *the service of the writ petitioners shall not be disturbed and the respondent shall not issue any advertisement against the vacant post*”. This interim order was directed to be continued until further orders vide order dated 03.12.2025 and the next date fixed for the matter is 04.02.2026.

8. However, the State respondent apparently on the basis of the said order dated 09.12.2025 (supra) had, through the respondent No.10, issued advertisement dated 19.12.2025 calling for filling up of 14 (fourteen) posts, 9 (nine) of which are presently occupied by the applicants herein.

9. It is the further submission of the learned Sr. counsel that since the said advertisement was floated in the midst of an order passed by the learned Single Judge prohibiting issuance of the same and also since the applicants herein are not party to the writ petition No. 493 of 2022, as well as in the related appeal preferred by the State, therefore the import of the order dated 09.12.2025 has greatly affected their cause and has resulted in serious miscarriage of justice as far as they are concerned. Accordingly, it is but fit and proper for the said order dated 09.12.2025 to be reviewed. Hence, this application seeking leave to file such review application.

10. Mr. A. Kumar, learned AG, at the outset has challenge the maintainability of this application on the ground that no error apparent on the face of the record has been made out by the applicants herein and that the issuance of the said advertisement dated 19.12.2025 is a separate matter for



which, if aggrieved by the same, the remedy available to the applicants herein lies elsewhere.

11. Mr. K. Paul, learned Sr. counsel in his submission has maintained that this application has to be heard in the presences of all the parties, apparently, the private respondents No. 4 to 9 not being present today, as such notice may be issued upon such respondents and on their appearance this application may be accordingly disposed of.

12. We have given considerable thought to the submission and contention made by the learned counsels for the parties and we have also perused the application in hand.

13. As admitted, the applicants have sought for leave to prefer a review application to enable them to seek for review of this Court's order dated 09.12.2025 (supra). Evidently, the applicants are not party to the lis wherein the said order dated 09.12.2025 was passed. Even the private respondents therein have also not approached this Court with any application, or for review of the said order in question.

14. What this Court has observed is that in the said order dated 09.12.2025, there is no indication or reference has to how the implication of such order would affect the case of the applicants herein, the same apparently being confined only to the case of the 6 petitioners therein.

15. It is also the case of the applicants that the issuance of the said advertisement dated 19.12.2025 was in violation of the order dated 04.11.2025 passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court in WP (C) No. 555 of 2025, the applicants herein being petitioners in the said case. Therefore, it is the opinion of this Court that the remedy as far as the



applicants are concerned lies elsewhere and not by way of a review as sought for.

16. Under such circumstances, at this point of time we do not find merits in the prayer made in this application. The same is hereby rejected.

17. Application disposed of. No costs.

(B. Bhattacharjee)
Judge

(W. Diengdoh)
Judge

Meghalaya
09.01.2026
"Khraw"