



Serial No. 04
Supplementary List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 389 of 2026

Date of Decision: 30.09.2026

Smti Bilaris Sohkhwai,
D/o (L) Ta Sohkhwai,
R/o Sohkyrbam Dompklang Village under Nongkhlaw Syiemship
Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The Executive Committee,
Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council,
Represented by its Secretary.
2. The Executive Member, In-Charge Elaka,
Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council
3. Shri P. Syiemlieh,
The Chief/Syiem,
Office of the Nongkhlaw Syiemship, Mairang
Eastern West Khasi Hills District
4. Shri (Dr.) K.M. Syiemlieh,
The Deputy Chief/Deputy Syiem,
Office of the Nongkhlaw Syiemship, Mairang
Eastern West Khasi Hills District
5. The Headman,
Sohkyrbam Dompklang Village, Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya
6. The Headman,
Umrit Village, Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya
7. The Headman,
Sohkyrbam Rim Village, Ri Bhoi District, Meghalaya

... Respondent(s)



Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. R. Lyngdoh, Adv. with
Mr. Y. Diengdoh, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. P.S. Nongbri, Adv. (For R 1&2)

i) Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc: Yes/No

ii) Whether approved for publication in press: Yes/No

JUDGEMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Mr. R. Lyngdoh, learned counsel for the petitioner today has produced added materials which show that the demarcation of Sohkyrbam Domphlang was done as far back as on 26.03.2021, and against the said demarcation a Complaint had been filed on 15.06.2022, before the Deputy Secretary, Khasi Hills Autonomous District Council.

2. This Court has perused the document so produced and notes that the Complaint dated 15.02.2022, against the settlement of the boundary is not in the nature of a Political Appeal, and further it appears it has died a natural death.



3. Mr. R. Lyngdoh, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the main grievance of the writ petitioner is that she is not aware of the entire chain of events that had transpired in the earlier years and came to the knowledge of the demarcation only when she was served with a letter dated 22.07.2026, whereby the resolution of the Dorbar of Sohkyrbam Rim held on 14.07.2026, had been communicated to the petitioner. He further submits that the entire proceedings were conducted beyond the scope of *The Khasi Hills Autonomous District (Administration of Elaka Act) 1991*, and is therefore without any authority of law. He accordingly, prays for some relief.

4. Ms. P.S. Nongbri, learned counsel for the respondents Nos. 1 & 2, has submitted that the petitioner is pursuing a stale claim, inasmuch as, the order from which the entire dispute has emanated was passed as far back as on 26.03.2021. She further submits that even if the Complaint that has been filed is taken to be a political appeal, the same was hopelessly barred by delay, as it was filed more than a year after the order dated 26.03.2021, had been passed. She therefore, submits that the writ petition at this stage is not maintainable, as the petitioner still has recourse to civil remedy, if still aggrieved.

5. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and examined the materials as produced. As discussed above, the order from



which the entire dispute has emanated was passed as far back as on 26.03.2021, and the petitioner has come at a very late stage before this Court, by way of the instant writ petition.

6. However, it is noted that on the facts as placed especially the letter dated 22.07.2026, the petitioner can take recourse to alternative civil remedy and as such, no interference is called for at this stage by this Court.

7. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is not entertained and stands dismissed.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
30.09.2026
"V. Lyndem-AR-PS"