



Serial No. 22
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 89 of 2026

Date of Decision: 23.03.2026

1. Dr. Khrawburom Iawkoh
2. Shri Banshanglang Sutnga
3. Shri Draskan Dura
4. Shri Present Massar
5. Shri Aldrin Samiam

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council, Shillong
East Khasi Hills District represented by
The Secretary to the Executive Committee
2. Executive Member (EM) I/c Elaka KHADC,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya
3. The Joint Secretary to the Executive Member,
Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council, Shillong
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya
4. Syiem of Hima Khyrim,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya
5. Lyngdoh/Basan,
Raid Mawlieh, Khyrim Syiemship
6. Shri Sukher Nongrum,
Suspended Sordar, Raid Nongshken,
East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya

... Respondent(s)



Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. K.V. Kharlyngdoh, Adv. with
Ms. B. Myllem, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. P.S. Nongbri, Adv. (For R 1-3)
Ms. F. Kharsyiemiong, Adv. (For R 4)
Ms. A.D. Syiem, Adv. (For R 5)
Mr. R. Kharkrang, Adv. (For R 6)

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. The present writ petition has been filed assailing the stay of the suspension order dated 28.11.2025, issued against the respondent No. 6 (Shri Sukher Nongrum, suspended Sordar, Raid Nongshken) and the appointment of an Acting Sordar on 24.01.2026.

2. The entire dispute concerns the office of the Sordar, Raid Nongshken, wherein on a complaint before the respondent No. 4 (Syiem of Hima Khyrim), the matter was taken up by the respondent No. 5 (office of Basan, Raid Mawlieh), who suspended the respondent No. 6. Thereafter, the said respondent No. 6, being aggrieved had approached the respondents Nos. 1, 2 & 3 (Executive Committee, Khasi



Hills Autonomous District Council), who stayed the said suspension order vide order dated 23.02.2026 passed in Political Appeal No. 1 of 2026. The petitioner therefore, being aggrieved with the stay of the suspension, is before this Court praying for appropriate orders.

3. Mr. K.V. Kharlyngdoh, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioner along with 4(four) others who are Headmen of Raid Nongshken had approached the respondent No. 4 with a complaint against the respondent No. 6, and that in the course of the proceedings, the respondent No. 5 (Basan, Raid Mawlieh) had suspended the respondent No. 6. He further submits that without being made them parties or they being heard, the said suspension order was then stayed by the respondents Nos. 1, 2 & 3, in an appeal filed by the respondent No. 6.

4. Ms. P.S. Nongbri, learned counsel for the respondents Nos. 1, 2 & 3, submits that the respondent No. 6, while approaching the Executive Committee of the District Council by way of the Political Appeal, had not arrayed the petitioners as necessary parties, and further submits that it is in these circumstances, the impugned order was passed.

5. The short point that arises now is whether the suspension order issued by Raid Mawlieh, which is a Raid under the Syiemship



was correct or whether it was incompetent to issue such a suspension order. A perusal of *The Khasi Hills Autonomous District (Nomination, Succession and Election of Syiem, Deputy Syiem, Lyngskor, Bakhraw, Sordar Shnat Raid, Longsan Mansan Shnat Raid, Rangbah Shnong or Sordar Shnong and Administration of Khyrim Syiemship) Act, 2024* at Section-21 thereof, which deals with term of office, removal and suspension of the Sordar Shnat Raid or Rangbah Shnong or Sordar Shnong, it is seen that removal from office or suspension is only by the Syiem or the Acting Syiem and Executive Dorbar, if he violates the conditions of his appointment or Sanad. In the instant case it is seen and undisputed, that the suspension order was passed by the Lyngdoh/Basan, Raid Mawlieh, which is the authority below the Syiem, and as such by operation of the Act could not have been delegated this authority, by the respondent No. 4 (Syiem).

6. In this view of the matter therefore, without entering into the other merits of the case and purely on this law point, the matter is liable to be remanded back to the respondent No. 4, for consideration in accordance with law, inasmuch as, the suspension order dated 28.11.2025, was without jurisdiction and passed by an authority incompetent to do so.



7. Accordingly, as the parties present also do not object to the remand of the matter to the respondent No. 4, for disposal, this writ petition is disposed of by remanding the matter with directions that the same be disposed of within a period of 2(two) months, from the date of receipt of a copy of the Court's order. Consequently, the impugned order dated 23.02.2026 and also the order dated 28.11.2025 passed by the respondent No. 5 (Basan, Raid Mawlieh), are hereby set aside. It is further directed that status quo shall be maintained as on today, and until the matter is disposed of and further orders are passed by the respondent No. 4.

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

JUDGE

Meghalaya
23.03.2026
"V. Lyndem-PS"