



Serial No.03
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

Cont. Cas(C). No. 25 of 2025

Date of Decision: 25.11.2025

Smti. Victrolla K.Sangma,
W/o Dr. P.K.Marak,
R/o Upper Rongkon,
Near 132 KV Grid Sub Station,
West Garo Hills District,
Meghalaya.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

Shri. Jagdish Chelani,
District Collector/Deputy Commissioner (Revenue),
West Garo Hills District, Tura,
Meghalaya.

...Respondents

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. S.Chanda, Adv.
Ms. S.Khatun, Adv.
Ms. B.Kharwanlang, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. S.Sen, GA.
Ms. Z.E.Nongkynrih, 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. This is a contempt application alleging violation of the order dated 31-07-2024, passed by this Court in WP(C). No. 268 of 2024.

2. Mr. S.Chanda, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that inspite of the interim orders operating, the respondents on 12-01-2025, as per newspaper report, had executed earthwork in widening the NH 51. Learned counsel further submits that the action of the respondents being in clear violation of the orders of this Court, necessary contempt proceedings be initiated against the respondents.

3. In response, Mr. S.Sen, learned GA on behalf of the respondents, has submitted that the land of the petitioner has firstly not been touched, and secondly, has also referred to the affidavit filed by the respondents which contains a letter dated 9th August, 2024. Learned GA submits that the only direction ever issued by the respondents was vide this letter and that also for removal of debris due to landslides at NH 217 road at a stretch from Chitoktak to Rongram areas which was causing inconvenience to the passing of vehicular traffic. Apart from this direction, the respondents had not issued any direction or indulged in any contemptuous act.



4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and examined the materials, it is seen that the newspaper report relied upon by the petitioner does not refer to the petitioner's land per se, and though it is submitted that the person named therein is the husband of the writ petitioner, no affidavit or any materials have been placed to support this contention. In order for contempt to be made out, the act of the respondents should be seen as wilful and in total disregard to the order of this Court. In the instant matter, apart from presentation of disputed facts, no wilful action of disobedience on the part of the respondents can be discerned. As such, the contempt is closed and disposed of.

Judge