



Serial No. 04
Supplementary List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 432 of 2024

Date of Decision: 08.07.2026

The United Remnant Church, Modynagar, Tura,
West Garo Hill, represented by its
President Henysing A Sangma

.... **Petitioner(s)**

Versus

1. The Garo Hill Autonomous District Council,
Represented by its Secretary, Tura,
West Garo Hills.
2. The Chief Executive Member, Revenue Tribunal,
Garo Hill Autonomous District Council, Tura
West Garo Hills.
3. The Executive Member, I/C Land & Revenue,
Garo Hill Autonomous District Council, Tura
West Garo Hills
4. The Garo Section of seventh Day Adventist Church,
New Tura, Araimile, West Garo Hills
Represented by its President, Shri Prodeep Sangma.

... **Respondent(s)**

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. D. Hynniewta, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. S. Dey, Adv. (For R 1-3)
Mr. H. Nongkhlaw, (For R 4)



-
- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| 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 petitioner before this Court who is stated to be the founder President of Seventh Day Adventist Church, Modynagar, Tura had purchased a plot of land and after obtaining the Patta had constructed a Church in the year 1987. The original Church later on came to be known as Tura Adventist Town Church, and the Patta was renewed in the new name, which however was objected by the respondent No. 4 (Garo Section of Seventh Day Adventist Church, Tura, Araimile).

2. It appears that thereafter, proceedings before the revenue authorities in the Garo Hills Autonomous District Council on the question of the Patta had resulted in the impugned order dated 16.10.2024, where the respondent No. 4, had filed an appeal against an order dated 13.10.2022, which dismissed the appeal filed by the appellant against the order of the Assistant Settlement Officer, on the ground of limitation. It is noted that the impugned order has recorded



that the name of the appellant (respondent No. 4), had been cancelled without due notice, but however observed that since the main matter was pending in a Title Suit, the parties were directed to await the outcome and to agitate their rights therein.

3. Today the parties have jointly submitted that though on several dates the Trial Court where the Title Suit is pending, had fixed the matter for judgment, but in view of settlement talks, the matter has been kept pending. They further submit that as it appears that the settlement talks are inconclusive, perhaps the Judgment and Order in the Title Suit be pronounced to enable the parties to take further steps.

4. Mr. S. Dey, learned counsel for the official respondent Garo Hills Autonomous District Council has also supported the submissions made by the parties and submits that since the main matter is pending in the Title Suit and the judgment is yet to be pronounced, perhaps the matter can be closed by issuing directions that the judgment be pronounced, so that the parties can take their cases forward.

5. This Court on hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on examination of the materials on record, notes that the Title Suit pending before the Assistant to Deputy Commissioner, West Garo Hills, Tura has a direct bearing in the issue regarding the Patta and as



far back as on December, 2024, the judgment was to be pronounced, but the same had been re-fixed from time to time through the year 2025, due to the fact that the settlement was being worked upon. However, as it is seen that the settlement is not probable, in the circumstances of the case it would be therefore, more expedient that the Judgment that has been reserved be pronounced, and the parties left to take further steps in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, as ordered above, the matter stands closed and is accordingly disposed of.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
08.07.2026
"V. Lyndem-AR-PS"