



Serial No.03
Supp. List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 83 of 2026

Date of Decision: 03.03.2026

Shri. Phrident Singh Thabah
S/o Smti. I.Thabah,
R/o. 24, NEHU Road, P.O.Phudmawri,
East Khasi Hills District,
Meghalaya – 794001.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. State of Meghalaya,
Through the Chief Secretary to
Government of Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The Deputy Commissioner/Collector
Cum Certificate Officer, Ri Bhoi District,
Nongpoh.
3. The Additional Deputy Commissioner
(Revenue), Ri Bhoi District, Nongpoh.
4. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India,
Mawngap Branch, East Khasi Hills
District.
5. The Branch Manager, Central Bank of
India, XANTCO St Anthony College Branch,
East Khasi Hills.
6. The Lead Bank Manager,
State Bank of India, Nongpoh.

...Respondents



Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. Philemon Nongbri, Adv.
Mr. R.Pahsyntiew, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. A.Kumar, AG with
Mr. J.N.Rynjah, GA.
Ms. I.Syiemlieh, Adv.
Ms. S.Laloo, GA for R 1-3.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| 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. Philemon Nongbri, learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Issue notice.
3. Learned Advocate General assisted by Mr. J.N.Rynjah, learned GA is present for the respondents No. 1-3, as such, no further notice is called for on these respondents.
4. As the prayer of the writ petitioner is very limited, notice is not necessary to be issued to the remaining respondents which are the Banks.
5. It is submitted that the writ petitioner is aggrieved with the orders dated 11-12-2025 and 29-01-2026, where proceedings under the Bengal



Public Demand Recovery Act, 1913, which had been instituted against the petitioner have been disposed of. Mr. Philemon Nongbri, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that in the disposal of the said proceedings, which is stated to be the recovery of certain amounts which had been disbursed for compensation, the materials relied upon by the quasi-judicial authority, more particularly, an order dated 14-05-2025, issued by the Syiem of Myllem, was not supplied to the petitioner. He submits that though the challenge has been made to the impugned orders, at this stage, the prayer of the petitioner is limited only to the supply of the materials which have been relied upon by the respondents while passing the said impugned orders, to enable him to take further steps in accordance with law.

6. Learned Advocate General on behalf of the respondents No. 1-3, has submitted that no case is made out for any interference by this Court, inasmuch as, firstly, the matter concerns disputed facts and also that the case of the writ petitioner is without any substantial basis. Learned Advocate General has taken this Court through the documents from which the entire transaction has arisen, such as, the agreement entered into by the writ petitioner and the alleged vendor of the land, which has been acquired. He therefore, submits that the very root of the matter being based on an unregistered and unconfirmed document, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed in limine.



7. This Court, on hearing the learned counsel for the parties, and also on examination of the materials on record, notes that the matter concerns disputed facts, apart from the avenues of alternate remedy which have been availed to by the writ petitioner. However, considering the fact that the only prayer at this stage is for supply of the documents relied upon by the authorities to come to the finding in the Recovery proceedings, this Court without entering into the merits of the matter, directs that the order dated 14-05-2025, issued by the Syiem of Myllem be made available to the writ petitioner, to enable him to avail of other alternate remedy in accordance with law.

8. As nothing further remains for consideration presently, this writ petition is closed and disposed of.

Judge