Serial No.07
Daily List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WA No.18/2026

Date of order: 14.08.2026

Shri Firstbornson Lyngkhoi ..... Appellant

Vs.

1. The State of Meghalaya, represented by the Chief Secretary, Government of Meghalaya, Shillong.

2. The Department of Public Works (Roads & Building) Department, represented by the Secretary, Government of Meghalaya.

3. The Chief Engineer, Public Works Department (Roads), Lachumiere, Shillong-793119, Meghalaya.

4. The Superintendent Engineer, Western Circle, Public Works Department (Roads), Nongstoin, West Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.

5. The Executive Engineer, Public Works Department (Roads), Nongstoin Division, Nongstoin-793119, West Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.

6. Shri Bunsing Sohphoh

7. Shri Specialist Rilung Marbaniang

8. Smti. Banrihun Wahlang

9. Smti. Brillianda Marngar

10. Smti. Droining Iawphniaw

11. Smti. Kynsai Kurbah

12. Shri Ioanis Lyngdoh

13. Smti. Rosiful Wanniang ..... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Revati Mohite Dere, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Appearance:

For the Appellants : Ms. T. Sutnga, Adv with
Ms. A. Ksoo, Adv

For the Respondents : Mr. A. Kumar, Advocate General with
Mr. J.N. Rynjah, GA
Mr. G. Syngkrem, Adv for R/6-13

JUDGMENT: (per the Hon'ble, the Chief Justice): (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. By this appeal, the appellant essentially seeks modification and alteration of the judgment and order dated 9th April, 2026, passed by the learned Single Judge in WP (C) No. 166 of 2025, insofar as it awards costs of ₹50,000/- only to the appellant.

3. According to the learned counsel for the appellant, the appellant should have been awarded more costs, having regard to the peculiar facts.

4. Mr. Kumar, learned Advocate General submits that costs as directed have been paid to the appellant. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.6 to 13, on instructions also states that the said respondents have paid ₹5000/- each to the appellant, as directed by the learned Single Judge. He states that the said payment has been made online to the appellant.

5. Payment of costs to the appellant (original petitioner) was completely a discretionary relief and as such, there is hardly any scope for interference in the same. The appellant in appeal cannot seek enhancement of costs.

6. Having perused the judgment and order passed by the learned Single Judge and the circumstances in which the appellant was awarded costs, we do not understand how the appellant by filing the aforesaid appeal can seek enhancement of costs. Thus, we find no reason to entertain the appeal and as such, dismiss the appeal.

(W. Diengdoh)
Judge

(Revati Mohite Dere)
Chief Justice

Meghalaya
14.08.2026
"Lam DR-PS"

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by
LAMPHRANG KHARCHANDY
Date: 2026.08.17 10:03:49 IST