



Serial No. 69
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

Cont.Cas(C) No. 6 of 2026

Date of Decision: 28.07.2026

Prof. Nirmalendu Saha,
S/o Late B. Saha,
Professor, Department of Zoology,
North Eastern Hill University,
Shillong-793022, Meghalaya

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1.Prof. Prabha Shankar Shukla,
Vice-Chancellor of North Eastern Hill University (NEHU)
Mawkyntroh-Umshing, Shillong-793022,
Meghalaya.

2. Prof. K.C. Biswal,
Registrar of North Eastern Hill University
Mawkyntroh-Umshing, Shillong-793022,
Meghalaya.

... Respondent(s)/Contemnor(s)

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. S. Pandey, Adv. with
Mr. S.A Majaw, Adv.
Ms. B. Lyngdoh, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Y.S. Mannan, Adv. with
Mr. I. Kharmujai, 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. S. Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. Y.S. Mannan, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The instant Contempt application alleges violation of the order of this Court dated 03.12.2025, passed in WP(C) No. 539 of 2025, wherein directions were issued for reinstatement of the petitioner into service, who was under suspension.

3. Mr. S. Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though this Court's order was passed on 03.12.2025, and the respondents were made aware that the petitioner was to retire on 31.12.2025, which was also brought to the notice of this Court, the reinstatement order which he submits does not constitute full compliance of the order of this Court, was issued only on 27.04.2026, in a cryptic fashion. He however, submits that notwithstanding the cryptic nature of the reinstatement order, if the respondents clarify that the petitioner would be deemed to be in service w.e.f. 16.10.2025 till his superannuation i.e. 31.12.2025, the writ petitioner will not press the Contempt application.



4. Mr. Y.S. Mannan, learned counsel for the respondents has been at pains to explain the cause of delay, and has also taken this Court an e-mail communication dated 05.12.2025, to demonstrate the efforts that the respondents have taken to comply with the order. He further submits that the non-compliance of the order is not willful, but was delayed due the circumstances that was prevailing in the University, which had affected its smooth and routine functioning. It is also submitted that the re-instatement order in view of the order passed by this Court was clear with regard to the date of his reinstatement. He therefore, prays that in the circumstances, as there has been no willful violation, the contempt be closed.

5. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and examined the materials as available. It is correct as submitted that the order of this Court is categorical as far as it concerned the expeditious action to be taken for reinstatement in view of impending superannuation, which however it is seen to have taken a period of 4(four) months, thereafter for compliance. Though this Court is not happy with the wordings of the reinstatement order, and though in contempt jurisdiction, the issues to be taken up are limited only as to whether a contempt has been made out, it is expected that the respondents



immediately clarify the matter, within a period of 3(three) weeks, failing which Suo Motu Contempt will be taken up by this Court.

6. The instant Contempt application at this stage, stands closed.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
28.07.2026
"V. Lyndem-AR-PS"