



**Serial No. 29**  
**Regular List**

**HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA**  
**AT SHILLONG**

WP(C) No. 270 of 2025

Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

---

Smti Ealenni Momin,  
W/o (L) Orindro Sangma,  
R/o Baida, P.O. Chotipara,  
P.S. Krishnai, Goalpara, Assam

**... Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

1. The State of Meghalaya represented by  
The Commissioner and Secretary, Education Department,  
govt of Meghalaya, Shillong
2. Director of School Education & Literacy,  
Meghalaya, Shillong
3. The Director of the Local Audit Fund,  
Meghalaya, Shillong.
4. The Managing Committee of Songsak United  
Deficit Secondary School, East Garo Hills, Meghalaya

**... Respondent(s)**

---

**Coram:**

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

---

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. S.A. Sheikh, Adv. with  
Mr. M.R. Marak, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. S. Ain, GA with  
Mr. A.M. Pala, GA

---



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

**JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner who is stated to be the legally wedded wife of one Shri (L) Orindro Sangma, who served as LDA at the United Songsak Deficit Secondary School is before this Court praying for release of gratuity and other admissible terminal benefits along with interest, from the date of entitlement till date of actual payment.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the husband of the petitioner entered service on 01.08.1990, in the aforementioned School, retired on September, 2017, and ultimately expired on 12.05.2023. However, as the dues were not released, the petitioner has preferred the instant writ petition.

3. Mr. S.A Shiekh, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the only hindrance that exists with regard to the release of gratuity and other terminal benefits, is the objections of the respondents to the age of her husband when he entered service.

4. Ms. S. Ain, learned GA with regard to the objections of the age, has drawn the attention of this Court to the affidavit filed on behalf of the State respondents, more particularly to a communication dated



25.02.2021, wherein the case of the deceased employee Shri Orindro Sangma, has been considered. She submits that as per the entry in the Service Book, his Date of Birth was recorded as 15.09.1957, whereas as per the HSLC Admit Card/Certificate, his age as on 01.03.1978, was shown as 20 years 6 months, which would mean that the Date of Birth of Shri Orindro Sangma should be 01.09.1957 instead of 15.09.1957. The learned GA further submits that though the discrepancy is marginal, the only fact that remains is that the petitioner while entering into service was overaged, by 11 months. She also submits that the deceased employee had never approached the respondents in connection with the pension matter during his lifetime, and that the respondents are still considering the case at their level.

5. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and as submitted by the counsel, it is noted that the deceased employee Shri (L) Orindro Sangma was aged 32 years 11 months, at the time of entering service. However, one fact that cannot be overlooked is that the petitioner was appointed in a regular manner by the respondents, who had also availed of his services till his retirement. In this respect, perhaps the respondents are liable to be directed to consider positively the condonation of the date of entry into service and to factor in, and compute the entitlements accordingly.



6. A Judgment dated 28.02.2022 passed in WA No. 9/2020 in the case of *Smti Manjusree Dutta vs. Smti Sujata Deb Roy & Ors.* has also been placed by the learned counsel for the petitioner in support of his case, wherein at Para-8 thereof, it has been quoted that the upper age limit for appointment to Government aided School is 35 + 5, for Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe.

7. Accordingly, the respondents are therefore, directed to dispose of the matter within a period of 3(three) months by taking into account all the relevant factors, including the Judgment rendered by this Court, as quoted above for release of the gratuity and terminal benefits. Needless to add, with regard to the interest, the respondents are to decide accordingly.

8. The matter thus stands closed and is accordingly disposed of.

**JUDGE**

Meghalaya  
24.03.2026  
"V. Lyndem-PS"