



Serial No. 02
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 255 of 2025

Date of Decision: 30.08.2025

Smti Kwenlin Sun,
D/o H. Mawlong,
R/o Lawmei Pdengshnong,
Shillong-793005, Meghalaya

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council, Shillong
Represented by the Secretary to the Executive Committee,
Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council, Shillong
2. The Secretary to the Executive Committee,
Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council, Shillong
3. The Joint Secretary, Executive Committee,
Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council, Shillong

... Respondent(s)

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s)	:	Dr. N. Mozika, Sr. Adv. with Mr. M.L. Nongpiur, Adv. Ms. M. Myrchiang, Adv.
For the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. T.T. Diengdoh, Sr. Adv. with Mr. C.C.T. Sangma, Adv.



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 writ petitioner being aggrieved with the cancellation of a Work Order/Agreement dated 12.05.2023 for preparation and printing of Digital Smartcard Based Sticker Computerised Trading Licence, for the use of the respondents is before this Court assailing the same primarily on the ground that though the Agreement is for a period of 5(five) years, the same was arbitrarily cancelled by the impugned order without any notice or show cause to the writ petitioner.

2. Dr. N. Mozika, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr. M.L. Nongpiur, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the writ petitioner who is the proprietor of an enterprise engaged for the preparation and printing of Digital Smartcards had been awarded the Work Order dated 12.05.2023, on the agreed rate and that on the said Agreement itself, it has been given that the period of the contract shall be for 5(five) years subject to renewal for further period. The abrupt cancellation he submits is in violation of the terms of the Agreement as



well as arbitrary, inasmuch as, the writ petitioner was not even given a notice. He therefore, prays that appropriate orders be passed as the petitioner has been cloaked with valuable rights to execute the said Work Order.

3. Mr. T.T. Diengdoh, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr. C.C.T. Sangma, learned counsel on behalf of the respondents has submitted that the cancellation was necessitated due to the fact that on examination of the manner as to how the work has been settled, it appears that the same was not by the Executive Committee but by the Executive Member i/c Trade etc., which he submits militates against the provision of Rule 31 of *The Assam and Meghalaya Autonomous Districts (Constitution of District Councils) Rules, 1951* He further submits that the manner in which the contract has been settled also leaves much to be desired, as it involves a matter of public largesse. The learned Senior counsel finally submits that there is no ground for interference and if the petitioner is at all aggrieved, the respondents are willing to re-examine the matter by affording her adequate opportunity to present her case, before the Executive Committee.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the materials on record, it is seen that the impugned order



dated 04.06.2025, cancelling the work order of the writ petitioner was apparently, only on the ground that the respondents have decided that the preparation and printing of Digital Smartcards Based Sticker would be done departmentally. The impugned order also does not disclose as to what further action was proposed with regard to the existing contract, that was rightly or wrongly granted to the writ petitioner. This Court has also perused the extension dated 12.05.2023, whereby direction has been given for preparation of 5(five) years work order. The same also as submitted by the learned Senior counsel was under the signature of only 1(one) Executive Member.

5. Without further dwelling into the merits of the matter or examining the claims or counter-claims of the parties, it is deemed appropriate to direct the respondent No. 2, to afford the writ petitioner an opportunity to present her case as to why the work should not be cancelled. On the presentation thereof, and after hearing the petitioner, the respondent No. 2, shall take a balanced decision and pass appropriate orders thereon. The entire exercise should be completed within a period of 10(ten) days from the date of receipt of this order by the respondents.



6. The impugned order is accordingly set aside but it is further provided that status quo to be maintained till final orders are passed by the respondent No. 2.

7. With the above noted directions, the matter stands closed and is accordingly disposed of.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
30.08.2025
"V. Lyndem-PS"