



Serial No.01
Supp. List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 17 of 2026

Date of Decision: 02.02.2026

1. Durbar Shnong Urksew Wahpathaw Village,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya
Represented by its Headman.
2. Shri. Archalson Lyngdoh,
Headman of Village Urksew Wahpathaw,
S/o R. Pariat, Aged about 46 years,
R/o Urksew Wahpathaw,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council,
Shillong, represented by the Secretary to the
Executive Committee.
2. Deputy Chief Executive Member,
I/c Elaka Administration, etc.,
Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council,
Shillong.
3. Shri Bishal Tham,
S/o T. Khongsni,
R/o Urksew Wahpathaw,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.
4. Acting Sordar, Raid Shabong,
East Khasi Hills District Meghalaya,
represented by Shri. Biggestson Lyngdoh.

...Respondents



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

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. R.Majaw, Adv.
Ms. A.Kharshiing, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. C.C.T.Sangma, Adv. for R 1 & 2.

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Heard Mr. R.Majaw, learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. The writ petitioner is before this Court assailing the letter dated 21-01-2026, on the ground that though this Court by order dated 11-11-2025, had directed for convening of a dorbar to finalise the voters list for election of Headman to Urksew-Wahpathaw, the respondents 1 & 2, by the impugned letter had instead directed for convening of a dorbar to elect a Headman.
3. Mr. C.C.T.Sangma, learned counsel for the respondents No. 1 & 2, has submitted that a bare reading of the letter would show that the dorbar



sought to be convened is only for finalising the voters list to iron out the discrepancies, and the reference to the election of the Headman does not mean that elections are to be held on the date of the meeting. He therefore, submits that the writ petition being premature not be entertained.

4. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and also examined the materials on record. On perusing the impugned letter dated 21-01-2026, both in the vernacular and translated copy, this Court does not find that there is any categorical direction or implication in the impugned letter that the election of Headman will be held on that date. It appears that the writ petitioner has approached this Court purely on apprehension.

5. In this view of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of at this stage itself, by directing that the orders passed earlier be complied with in letter and spirit.

6. Matter stands disposed of.

Judge