



Serial No. 01
Supplementary
List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

CrI.Petn. No. 136 of 2026

Date of order: 07.09.2026

1. Shri. xxxx A xxxx
2. Shri. xxxx B xxxx
3. Shri. xxxx C xxxx
4. Master xxxx D xxxx
5. Master xxxx E xxxx
6. Master xxxx F xxxx

...Petitioners/Accused persons

- versus -

1. State of Meghalaya, through the Secretary, Home Police.
2. Shri. Jerry Phanbuh, S/o Smti. Ivy R. Phanbuh, R/o Nongthymmai, Lawjynriew, Shillong, East Khasi Hills District, Meghaaya.

...Respondents

3. Smti. Vanisha Wahlang, D/o (L) J. Kharpor, R/o C/o S.S. Wahlang, Oakland Road, Opposite CM's Bungalow, Shillong, East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.

....Proforma Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Revati Mohite Dere, Chief Justice

Appearance:

For the Petitioner : Mr. J.I. Nongrum, Adv. with
Mr. I. Kharmujai, Adv.

For the Respondents : Mrs N.G. Shylla, PP with
Ms O.A.I. Bang, GA
Mr R. Kharkrang, Adv. [R2&3]

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



JUDGMENT: (Oral)

Not on Board. Taken on Board.

2. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.
3. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith with the consent of the parties and the aforesaid petition is taken up for final disposal.
4. By this petition, the petitioners seek quashing of the FIR dated 11.07.2026 registered with the Laitumkhrah Police Station, being Laitumkhrah P.S. Case No. 99 of 2026 at the behest of the respondent No. 2 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 351(3)/324(3)/3(5) of the BNS, 2023.
5. Quashing is sought on the premise that the parties, i.e., the petitioners have amicably settled their dispute with the respondent No. 2 (original complainant and Manager) of the concerned Home Stay and the respondent No. 3 (owner of the Home Stay).
6. At the outset, it may be noted that the names of the petitioners have been truncated and set out as alphabets having



regard to the fact that all the petitioners are students and three out of six accused are minors, i.e., one is 15 years, two are 17 years and one, who has just completed 18 years. Two of these minors have just completed standard 12th and one is studying in standard 12th. The petitioner No. 1 also is a student, preparing for the Staff Selection Exams and the petitioner No. 2 is also a student preparing for the examination of Junior Teacher conducted by the U.P. State Government. All the petitioners are inter se related, inasmuch as they are cousins.

7. The incident took place on 10.07.2026 when two of the petitioners checked into a Home Stay alongwith four others. According to the complainant, i.e., the respondent Nos. 2 and 3, the petitioners had booked one room and as such, only three persons were permitted to occupy one room, which was booked by them. It is the complainant's case that three more persons though not permitted, checked into the said room. When the complainant objected, it appears that one of the petitioners paid only a small amount for the extra persons and threatened the complainant. It also appears that, when the complainant objected to the same, the petitioners caused damage to the



property, i.e., caused damage to the interior door; caused extensive stains resembling blood spatter on the cushions, bedsheet and walls of the room thereby, damaging the walls skirting and plant pot area. The petitioners are also alleged to have strewn food, wrappers and garbage across the carpet and floor, and heavily soiled the wash-basin area. When the complainant objected to the unapproved extra guests, the petitioner No. 1 threatened the complainant. Pursuant to the incident, the complainant i.e., respondent No. 2 lodged a complaint with the Laitumkhrah Police Station, which was registered as an FIR for the aforesaid alleged offences.

8. Pursuant to the registration of the FIR, the petitioner Nos. 1, 2 and 3 were arrested on 13.07.2026 and subsequently, enlarged on bail, and the petitioner Nos. 4, 5 and 6, i.e., children in conflict with law, were released on bail by the Juvenile Justice Board on 13.07.2026.

9. It appears that the petitioners having realised their mistake approached the complainants i.e., the respondent Nos. 2 and 3, pursuant to which the parties entered into a deed of mutual compromise and settlement on 17.08.2026. The said



deed of compromise is at page 64 of the petition and has been signed by all the parties. The said deed of mutual compromise and settlement dated 17.08.2026 has been entered into between the respondent No. 2 (Manager of the Home Stay) and the respondent No. 3 (owner of the Home Stay) on the one hand and the petitioners on the other. The authorisation given by the petitioner No. 3 (owner of the Home Stay) to the petitioner No. 2 has been annexed at page 59 of the petition. From the compromise entered into, it appears that with the intervention of elders of the locality and mutual well-wishers, the parties have resolved their dispute to ensure future peace and harmony.

10. It appears that for the damage caused by the petitioners, the petitioners have paid a lumpsum of ₹2,06,000/- by way of full and final monetary compensation, to the respondent No. 3, i.e., proprietor of the Home Stay. Pursuant to the said payment, the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 have agreed to give their no objection to the quashing of the FIR, pursuant to which the aforesaid petition has been filed. It also appears from the terms of settlement, that the petitioners have tendered their sincere



and unconditional apology for their behaviour and actions, and have expressed regret for their actions.

11. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 on instructions states that the said respondents do not dispute the settlement and the fact that the petitioners have paid a lumpsum of ₹2,06,000/- by way of full and final monetary compensation, and that the petitioners have tendered their sincere and unconditional apology to the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 for causing disturbance, inconvenience, damage and other difficulties to them, in connection with the Home Stay.

12. Three out of the six petitioners as noted above, are children in conflict with law; one aged 15 years and two aged 17 years. One of the petitioners has just completed 18 years and is studying in first year B. Com; the other two petitioners are older, in their 20s and are studying for competitive exams. Considering the future and the welfare of the petitioners, and having regard to the fact, that the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 have given their no objection to the quashing of the FIR, and that the said respondents have accepted the unconditional apology tendered by the petitioners and also having regard to the judgments of the



Apex Court in this regard, there is no impediment if the petition is allowed.

13. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR registered with the Laitumkhrah Police Station, being Laitumkhrah P.S. Case No. 99 of 2026 at the behest of the respondent No. 2 qua the petitioners is quashed and set aside subject to the following terms and conditions.

1) The petitioner Nos. 1 and 3 will pay a sum of ₹25,000/- each to the respondent No. 3 in addition to what they have already paid. The same to be paid within one week directly into the respondent No.3's account by NEFT/RTGS.

2) The petitioner Nos. 1 and 3 will also do community service for a period of six days as under:

(i) Three days with the Sikh Centre Sri Guru Singh Sabha, Lachumiere, Shillong starting tomorrow, i.e., 8th, 9th and 10th September, 2026 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. The community service shall be done under the supervision of Dr Kamaljeet Singh.

(ii) Three days with the 'Project Operation Clean- Up', which is conducted by Jiva Cares from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. under the supervision of a person to be appointed by the said NGO.



14. A report as to whether the work carried out by the petitioner Nos. 1 and 3 is satisfactory or not, to be submitted to this Court on the next date through the concerned Public Prosecutor.

15. As far as the other petitioners are concerned, i.e., petitioner Nos. 2, 4, 5 and 6, considering their ages, no community service is being given to them.

16. The petition is allowed and Rule is made absolute on the aforesaid terms.

17. Petition is, accordingly disposed of.

17. Stand over to **15th September, 2026**, for recording compliance.

(Revati Mohite Dere)
Chief Justice