



**Serial No. 72**  
**Regular List**

**HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA**  
**AT SHILLONG**

WP(C) No. 540 of 2025

Date of Decision: 20.05.2026

---

Smti Monowara Begum,  
@ Monowara Bibi,  
W/o Shri Amir Hussain,  
R/o 32, Nayagaon (Bhaitbari) P/s- Phulbari  
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya

**... Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

1. State of Meghalaya represented by  
The Chief Secretary of Meghalaya
2. The Commissioner & Secretary,  
Community & Rural Development Department, Meghalaya
3. The Mission Director,  
State Rural Employment Society, Sympli Building, Dankhetti,,  
Shillong, Meghalaya
4. The Deputy Commissioner & District Programme Coordinator,  
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya
5. The Project Director & Additional Programme Coordinator,  
(MGNREGS), West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya
6. The Block Development Officer, (B.D.O) & Programme Officer  
(MGNREGS), Batabari C&RD Block, Batabari,  
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya
7. The Block Development Officer, (B.D.O) & Programme Officer  
(MGNREGS), Demdema C&RD Block, Demdema  
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya



8. Smti Zahenara Bibi,  
W/o Shri Mobobot Ali,  
R/o Nayagaon (Bhaitbari), P.O- Old Bhaitbari  
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya

9. Smti Nargis Begum,  
W/o Shri Mostafizur Rahman  
R/o Nayagaon (Bhaitbari), P.O- Old Bhaitbari  
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya

10. Smti Mozma Bibi @ Mojema Bibi,  
W/o Shri Osial Sk  
R/o Nayagaon (Bhaitbari), P.O- Old Bhaitbari  
West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya

... Respondent(s)

---

**Coram:**

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

---

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner (s) : Ms. M.L. Tlau, Adv. with  
Mr. R.H. Alice

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. E.R. Chyne, GA (For R 1-7)  
Mr. S.K. Hassan, Adv. with  
Ms. M. Rahman, Adv. (For R 8-10)

---

|    |                                                        |        |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in<br>Law journals etc: | Yes/No |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|

|     |                                               |        |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|--------|
| ii) | Whether approved for publication<br>in press: | Yes/No |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|--------|

---

**JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)**

1. The grievance of the writ petitioner is that though she was  
duly elected as President of Nayagaon (Bhaitbari) VEC, West Garo Hills,



Tura vide elections that were held on 06.06.2023, and that without any notice or complaint whatsoever, she was summarily removed on the re-constitution of the new VEC on 24.03.2025.

2. Ms. M.L. Tlau, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the respondents have acted arbitrarily and that moreover no such election was held on 24.03.2025, as alleged in view of the fact that the Headman was not present and that his signature was forged. She further submits that as the manner of the re-constitution the VEC is under a cloud, appropriate directions be issued for re-constitution of Nayagaon (Bhaitbari) VEC, by holding fresh elections involving all valid job card holders.

3. Mr. E.R. Chyne, learned GA for the respondents Nos. 1 to 7, has submitted that the Gaonbura certificate of not being present on 24.03.2025 stands disowned and suppressed by subsequent clarifications, and that the writ petitioner has failed to disclose the valid proceedings held on 24.03.2025. The learned GA has drawn the attention of this Court to a clarification letter dated 07.11.2025, issued by the Gaonbura, to substantiate his submission.

4. Mr. S.K. Hassan, learned counsel for the respondents Nos. 8, 9 & 10, has submitted that on the resignation of the Secretary of the earlier VEC, the new VEC was re-constituted with the respondents Nos. 8, 9 &



10, as President, Secretary and Women Member respectively. He further submits that the matter in fact has since rendered infructuous in view of the fact that the new VEC is functioning since 24.03.2025.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties. It appears that the dispute centers around as to whether the elections held on 24.03.2025 for the new VEC, were valid in nature. Added to this, the fact that the writ petitioner's term as President, even if serving would end or expire on 06.06.2026, cannot be ignored. Taking these two facts into consideration and looking into the disputed questions that have arisen with regard to the holding of elections to the VEC, this Court does not deem it fit to issue any directions for interference, but only that the respondent No. 6, if required shall receive complaints with regard to the functioning of the VEC, and to institute necessary action, if deemed necessary.

6. On these observations, the matter stands closed and disposed of.

**JUDGE**

Meghalaya  
20.05.2026  
"V. Lyndem-PS"