



Serial No. 24
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 386 of 2024

Date of Decision: 17.04.2026

Shri Stephenson Jahryne,
S/o Shri P.P. Jalong,
R/o Jyllep Village,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Meghalaya represented by its
Commissioner & Secretary, Personnel & Adm. Department,
Govt of Meghalaya, Shillong

2. The Deputy Commissioner,
South West Khasi Hills District, Mawkyrwat,
Meghalaya

3. Block Development Officer,
Ranikor C&RD Block, Ranikor,
West Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya

.... Respondent(s)

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. S. Thapa, Adv. with
Mr. B. Snaitang, Adv.
Mr. S. Khyriem, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. H. Abraham, GA with
Ms. S. Shyam, 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. Heard Mr. S. Thapa, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. H. Abraham learned GA for the respondents.

2. The writ petitioner who is stated to be serving as LDA in the office of the Block Development Officer, Ranikor C&RD Block, South West Khasi Hills, is before this Court praying for consideration for grant of promotion and also for release of consequential service benefits, such as increments, which is claimed to be due.

3. It is submitted by Mr. S. Thapa, learned counsel that the disruption in the service of the writ petitioner had occurred on being suspended on 24.08.2016, due to his arrest in connection with Mawsynram P.S. Case No. 14 (4) 2016, which is presently undergoing trial. The learned counsel further submits no Departmental proceeding was drawn up, but however after a considerable period of time the petitioner was then reinstated vide order dated 05.05.2023, and he rejoined his duties on 23.05.2023. It is further submitted that after the reinstatement, the



petitioner's entitlements have not been given consideration by the respondents and on a representation being preferred, the reasons given by the respondent No. 2, was that the matter regarding increments, promotion and other service benefits have been kept in abeyance, due to the pendency of the criminal trial. The learned counsel submits that in spite of the pendency of the criminal trial, the petitioner should not be deprived of his due service benefits, if found eligible after consideration.

4. Mr. H. Abraham, learned GA for respondents has submitted that the case of the petitioner was not considered due to the pendency of the trial.

5. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the materials, it is noted that though the writ petitioner has made a prayer for constitution of a DPC to consider his promotion and though he has made a claim that he had been superseded, the same has not been substantiated in any manner nor has even a gradation list or list of LDAs been annexed to the writ petition. At the most in the considered of this Court, the prayer can only be limited to the consideration by the respondents for grant of increments and other service benefits, notwithstanding the pendency of the trial.



6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction that the respondents give due consideration to the case of the petitioner, for grant or extension of due service benefits, as admissible.

7. As ordered above, the matter stands closed and is accordingly disposed of.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
17.04.2026
"V. Lyndem-PS"