

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 174 of 2024 with
WP(C) No. 175 of 2024
WP(C) No. 176 of 2024
WP(C) No. 177 of 2024
WP(C) No. 178 of 2024
WP(C) No. 179 of 2024
WP(C) No. 180 of 2024
WP(C) No. 181 of 2024
WP(C) No. 182 of 2024
WP(C) No. 183 of 2024

Date of Order: 27.06.2025

Smti. Baiantimon Blah	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 14 Ors.
Shri. Shanborlang Warjri	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 11 Ors.
Shri. Ronnieson Wahlang	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 14 Ors.
Shri. Peter Tremi Passah	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 10 Ors.
Shri. Ferdinand Banteilang Basan	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 13 Ors.
Smti. Dahunlang Veronica Lyngdoh	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 13 Ors.
Shri. Mark Andrew Challam	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 11 Ors.
Smti. Yvette Risa Mawlong	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 11 Ors.
Shri. Gautam Warjri	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 11 Ors.
Shri. Labiangbha Trevor Tariang	Vs.	State of Meghalaya & 14 Ors.

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. Bhattacharjee, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s) : Mr. S. Jindal, Adv
Mr. I. Kharmujai, Adv
Ms. R. Begum, Adv

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. N.D. Chullai, AAG with
Ms. R. Colney, GA
Mr. J.N. Rynjah, GA
Mr. S.A. Sheikh, GA
Mr. H. Abraham, GA
Mr. A.G. Momin, Adv
Ms. L.D. Sangma, Adv

Heard learned counsels appearing for the parties.

Mr. S. Jindal, learned counsel for the petitioner on instruction submitted that the list prepared by the department in terms of Sub-rule 2 of Rule 22 of the Meghalaya Civil Services Rules, 1975 is a confidential document and the petitioner is not privy to the same.

Mr. N.D. Chullai, learned AAG appearing for the State-respondents and Mr. A.G. Momin, learned counsel appearing for the private respondents disputed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. The learned counsels for the respondents have referred to the Notification No. PER.99/90/Pt.I/181 dated 07.03.2022 annexed with the writ petition and submitted that the notification contains the names of the officers arranged by the selection board under Sub-rule 2 of Rule 22 of the Meghalaya Civil Services Rules, 1975.

The learned counsel for the petitioner disagrees with the contention made by the respondents and submits that the notification dated 07.03.2022 is not a list prepared under Sub-rule 2 of Rule 22 of the Meghalaya Civil Services Rules, 1975.

In view of the above controversy, the learned AAG shall obtain instruction as to whether there exists any separate list other than the notification dated 07.03.2022 prepared by the selection board in terms of Sub-rule 2 of Rule 22 of the Meghalaya Civil Services Rules, 1975.

As agreed to by the parties, list this matter on 11.07.2025

Judge

Meghalaya
27.06.2025
“Shrity,PS”