



Serial No.01
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

Review Pet. No. 19 of 2025

Date of Decision: 08.04.2026

Shri. Reagle Warjri,
S/o (L) H. Soanes,
R/o Umroi, Nongrah, Ri-Bhoi District,
Meghalaya.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. The State of Meghalaya,
Represented by the Chief Secretary,
Government of Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The Secretary to the
Government of Meghalaya,
Revenue and Disaster Management Department,
Shillong.
3. The Deputy Commissioner (Revenue),
Ri-Bhoi District, Meghalaya.
4. The Additional Deputy Commissioner,
Ri-Bhoi District, Nongpoh.
5. Smti. Emma Tariang,
D/o (L) Viola Tariang,
R/o Mawlai Nonglum,
Shillong, East Khasi Hills District-793008.
6. Headman, Umden Mission Village,
P.O. Umroi, Ri-Bhoi District,
Meghalaya.



7. Smti. Jnger Ryntathiang,
Umden Mission Village,
P.O. Umroi, Ri-Bhoi District,
Meghalaya.

...Respondents

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. P.Yobin, Adv.
Ms. I.Laloo, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. A.H.Kharwanlang, Addl. Sr. GA.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| 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. P.Yobin, learned counsel for the review petitioner and Mr. A.H.Kharwanlang, learned Addl. Sr. GA for the State respondents.

2. This is an application seeking review of the judgment and order dated 18-07-2025, passed in WP(C). No. 106 of 2025, whereby this Court had directed the petitioner to seek remedy before the Civil Court.

3. It has been submitted by Mr. P.Yobin, learned counsel for the petitioner that due to the express bar under section 63 of the Right to Fair



Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, and availability of statutory remedy under section 64, the petitioner who is a person interested has been left without any effective remedy, which has resulted in a manifest error in the face of the record in the order dated 18-07-2025, which needs correction by this review application.

4. Mr. A.H.Kharwanlang, learned Addl. Sr. GA for the respondents has submitted that the petitioner will not come within the definition of a person interested, as he is nowhere associated or connected with the acquisition proceedings, which strictly concerns the property in question which was in dispute between the respondents No. 5 and 7. He further submits that in the earlier round of litigation, an affidavit had been filed wherein it had been stated that the application is barred by section 11, and also that the property was sought to be purchased after publication of the notification for acquisition had been issued. He therefore, prays that the review petition be dismissed.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. Mr. P.Yobin, learned counsel for the petitioner had been at pains to satisfy this Court on the ground of the petitioner being an interested person. However, on a perusal of the materials on record and on queries by the Court, he could not show that the petitioner was connected or associated in



the acquisition proceedings which had been mentioned in the petition, apart from the fact that he was an interested buyer who had invested a certain amount of money to acquire a plot of land of the respondent No. 5.

7. Accordingly, in the considered view of this Court, the review petitioner is not a person interested within the meaning of the Act, and as such, no grounds for review have been made out. The review application accordingly stands dismissed.

Judge