



Serial No.48
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 298 of 2025

Date of Decision: 01.06.2026

1. Shri Karbius Lyngdoh,
S/o (L) Elish Marwein,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.
2. Smti Pyntngenglang Shadap,
D/o Lagan Shadap,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.
3. Shri Balan Jalong,
S/o (L) Elias Nianglang,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.

...Petitioners

-Versus-

1. The Chairperson,
Meghalaya Lokayukta, Shillong.
2. The Secretary.
Meghalaya Lokayukta, Shillong.
3. Smti Jopsidiary Shadap,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village.
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.
4. Shri Donbok Rymbai,
R/o R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.



5. Smti Juliana Shadap,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.
6. Smti Wislailin Marwein,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.
7. Shri Kyrmen Rynghang,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.
8. Smti Balatei Rynghang,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi district, Meghalaya.
9. Shri Wanpyndap Lapang,
R/o of Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya.
10. Smti Ibashisha Myrsing,
R/o Nongrim Nongladaw village,
Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya.

Respondents

11. The Deputy Commissioner,
Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya.
12. The Project Director, DRDA,
Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya.
13. The Block Development Officer,
Bhoirymbong Block, Ri Bhoi district,
Meghalaya.

Pro Forma Respondents



Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. S.Deb, Adv.
Mr. J.Suchiang, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. S.Jindal, Adv. for R 1 & 2.
Ms. B.F.Kharwanlang, Adv. for R 3-10.
Mr. N.Syngkon, GA and
Mr. J.N.Rynjah, GA for R 11-13.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| 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. The petitioners who are stated to be the VEC functionaries of Nongrim Nongladaw village of Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya, are before this Court assailing an order dated 15-07-2025, whereby the respondent No. 1 has assumed jurisdiction with regard to the complaints lodged against the petitioner by the respondents No. 3 -10.

2. It has been submitted by Mr. S.Deb, learned counsel for the petitioners that the directions for investigation and for further proceedings



by the respondent No. 1 are without any jurisdictions, and in fact in contradiction of earlier orders passed by the said office itself, with regard to matters of investigations or complaints against the VEC functionaries. In this context, learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to an order dated 19-05-2022, passed in a Complaint Case No. 3 of 2021, wherein the earlier incumbent of respondent No. 1 had come to a finding that the Chairman and Secretary of a VEC do not find place in section 14 of the Meghalaya Lokayukta Act, 2014, or under clause (3) section 2 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. He therefore, submits that the entire premise for entertaining the complaints being incorrect, the writ petition be allowed and the proceedings before the respondent No. 1 be quashed.

3. Mr. S.Jindal, learned counsel for the respondents No. 1 & 2 has however submitted that the writ petitioners had submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of respondent No. 1, inasmuch as, there was a lapse of one year after the complaints had been lodged that they approached this Court. He further submits that the earlier order dated 19-05-2022, referred to by the writ petitioners was passed by the earlier Chairperson under a misconception as to the applicability of relevant law. He also submits that the writ petition is premature at this stage and that the preliminary investigations has already been concluded.



4. Ms. B.F.Kharwanlang, learned counsel for the respondents No. 3 –10 has endorsed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respondents No. 1 & 2, and has not tendered any further submissions.

5. Mr. N.Syngkon, learned counsel for the respondents No. 11–13, however, has supported the contention raised by the writ petitioners and submits that this fact had been brought to the notice of the respondent No. 1, who however, did not render any finding in this regard.

6. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on examination of the impugned order as well as the order dated 19-05-2022, passed in Complaint Case No. 3 of 2021, what appears to this Court in the first instance is the question of jurisdiction which is yet to be decided by the respondent No. 1 itself.

7. As such, not to linger with the matter any further, in the considered view of this Court, justice would be served at this stage if the matter is remanded back to the respondent No. 1, to firstly decide on the point of jurisdiction before proceeding any further with the matter.

8. Accordingly, as ordered above, the matter is disposed of with directions that the respondent No. 1 shall hear the matter afresh on the point of jurisdiction and until such further orders are rendered, no further



proceedings with regard to the investigation shall be undertaken by the respondent No. 1.

9. Matter stands closed and disposed of.

Judge