VERDICTUM.IN

Serial No. 01-03
Supplementary List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 294 of 2026 with
WP(C) No. 321 of 2026
WP(C) No. 377 of 2026

Reserved on: 22.09.2026
Pronounced on: 30.10.2026
Uploaded on: 30.10.2026

Whether the operative part or full judgment is pronounced: Full

---

WP(C) No. 294 of 2026

James P.K. Sangma, President
Meghalaya Cricket Association
J.N. Sports Complex, Polo Ground,
Shillong, Meghalaya – 793001 through
his Constituted Attorney Shri. Gurnain
Randhawa **…Petitioner(s)**

-Versus-

1. Rayanold Kharkamni, Honorary Secretary,
Meghalaya Cricket Association, J.N. Sports
Complex, Polo Ground, Shillong,
Meghalaya – 793001

2. Rajiv Bareh, Vice President, Meghalaya
Cricket Association, J.N. Sports Complex,
Polo Ground, Shillong, Meghalaya – 793001

3. Analdo Mebanphira Swer, Honorary Joint
Secretary, Meghalaya Cricket Association,
J.N. Sports Complex, Polo Ground, Shillong,
Meghalaya – 793001

VERDICTUM.IN

4. Eddystone Shylla, Honorary Treasurer,
Meghalaya Cricket Association, J.N. Sports
Complex, Polo Ground, Shillong,
Meghalaya – 793001

5. Chuba R. Marak, Member Councillor,
Meghalaya Cricket Association, J.N. Sports
Complex, Polo Ground, Shillong,
Meghalaya – 793001

6. The Board of Control for Cricket in India,
4th Floor, Cricket Centre, Wankhede Stadium
'D' Road, Churchgate, Mumbai,
Maharashtra – 40020

7. Retd. Justice B.D. Agarwal, Ombudsman,
Meghalaya Cricket Association **…Respondent(s)**

WP(C) No. 321 of 2026

1. Sri Rayonald Kharkamni
Honorary Secretary
Meghalaya Cricket Association
J N Sports Complex,
District: East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya

2. Shri. Rajiv Bareh, Vice-President
Meghalaya Cricket Association
J N Sports Complex,
District: East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya

3. Shri. Eddystone Shylla
Honorary Treasurer
Meghalaya Cricket Association
J N Complex, Polo Ground,
Shillong, Meghalaya – 793001 **…Petitioner(s)**

-Versus-

1. Shri. James P.K. Sangma
President

VERDICTUM.IN

Meghalaya Cricket Association
J.N Sports Complex
Meghalaya 793001

2. The State of Meghalaya
Represented by its Commissioner and
Secretary, Department of Sports &
Youth Affairs, Govt. of Meghalaya
Shillong **…Respondent(s)**

WP(C) No. 377 of 2026

1. Shri. Rayonald Kharkamni
Honorary Secretary
Meghalaya Cricket Association
Mawroh, Ri-Bhoi,
Meghalaya 793102 **…Petitioner(s)**

-Versus-

1. Shri. James P.K. Sangma
President
Meghalaya Cricket Association
J.N. Sports Complex, Polo Ground,
Shillong, Meghalaya

2. State of Meghalaya, Represented by its
Commissioner & Secretary, Department of
Sports & Youth Affair

3. Meghalaya State Commission for Women
Through its Chairperson
Nongrim Road, Laitumkhrah, East
Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya,
Shillong – 793003

4. Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI)
Represented by its President Shri. Mithun Manhas
Cricket Centre, Wankhede Stadium, 'D' Road,
Churchgate, Mumbai – 400020, Maharashtra **…Respondent(s)**

VERDICTUM.IN

Coram:

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

Appearance:

In WP(C) No. 294 of 2026

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s) : Mr. R.S. Rao, Sr. Adv. with
Dr. N. Mozika, Sr. Adv.
Ms. M. Myrchiang, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. A.K. Bhuyan, Sr. Adv. with
Dr. P.P. Medhi, Adv.
Mr. K.V. Kharlyngdoh, Adv.
Mr. W. Dkhar, Adv. (For R 1-5&7)
Mr. S. Khound, Adv.
Ms. G.C. Marboh, Adv. (For R 6).

In WP(C) No. 321 of 2026

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s) : Mr. A.K. Bhuyan, Sr. Adv. with
Dr. P.P. Medhi, Adv.
Mr. K.V. Kharlyngdoh, Adv.
Mr. W. Dkhar, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. R.S. Rao, Sr. Adv. with
Dr. N. Mozika, Sr. Adv.
Ms. M. Myrchiang, Adv.(For R 1)
Mr. S. Khound, Adv.
Mr. J.N. Rynjah, GA (For R 2).

In WP(C) No. 377 of 2026

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s) : Mr. S. Pandey, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. R.S. Rao, Sr. Adv. with
Dr. N. Mozika, Sr. Adv.
Ms. M. Myrchiang, Adv.(For R 1)
Mr. S. Khound, Adv.

VERDICTUM.IN

Mr. J.N. Rynjah, GA (For R 2)
Mr. S. Khound, Adv. with
Ms. G.C. Marboh, Adv. (For R 4).

i)	Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc.:	Yes/No
ii)	Whether approved for publication in press:	Yes/No

JUDGMENT:

1. In these series of writ petitions, the subject matter emanates from an acute institutional breakdown within the Meghalaya Cricket Association (MCA), most specifically the differences and disputes in the executive leadership i.e. the President and the Honorary Secretary, dealing with statutory findings of sexual harassment, institutional coverup and the question on the appointment and continuance of the Ombudsman. In WP(C) No. 294 of 2026, the petitioner who is the President has asserted the validity of the Ombudsman's appointment and also the legality of the Honorary Secretary suspension, as a mandatory emergency measure to comply with the Prevention of Sexual Harassment Act (POSH), mandate.

In WP(C) No. 321 of 2026 and WP(C) No. 377 of 2026, the Honorary Secretary as Petitioner, has put a challenge to the Ombudsman's appointment, apart from contending that the President lacks the power to

VERDICTUM.IN

unilaterally suspend an elected official without prior Apex Council concurrence.

2. For the petitioner in WP(C) No. 294 of 2026, and respondent No. 1 in WP(C) No. 321 of 2026 and WP(C) No. 377 of 2026. Mr. R.S. Rao, learned Senior counsel assisted by Ms. M. Myrchiang, learned counsel for the petitioner, in his opening arguments has questioned as to whether the respondents can seek to dislodge an Ombudsman, whose appointment was approved at the 26th Apex Council Meeting, acted upon, communicated to the BCCI and accepted by the appointee particularly when this Court by order dated 01.07.2026, had already directed that neither of the parties shall be allowed to undermine the Ombudsman's functioning till the next date of hearing. It is submitted that the records would reflect that a notice dated 03.03.2026, expressly placed the appointment of the Ombudsman before the 26th Apex Council Meeting, wherein, the Minutes record a specific decision of ratification of the appointment of Justice (Retd.) B. D. Agarwal, as Ombudsman, and for directions to issue an offer letter. The respondents No. 1, 2, 3 and 5 as arrayed in WP(C) No. 294 of 2026, it is submitted were present and participated in the meeting, and moreover, in their/ respondents writ petition itself, their presence is acknowledged wherein, the attendance sheet, as well as, the TA/DA sheet also contains their signatures. Thus he submits, the allegation that the appointment was forcefully imposed is misplaced, as

VERDICTUM.IN

not only was the decision recorded, but the same was also implemented. Learned Senior counsel submits that no objection was raised at this stage by the respondents, who continued to participate in the day-to-day administration of the association, until it became evident that the Ombudsman was likely to pass certain orders in light of the decision of the Meghalaya State Commission for Women(MSCW). It is then contended that the challenge to the appointment of the Ombudsman and the consequent action are clearly mala fide, and that a fact which remains is that the person seeking to displace the Ombudsman's authority, is himself the subject matter of proceedings before that Ombudsman. A further submission that has been made is that the respondent No. 1 himself, had relied upon the Ombudsman mechanism, when it suited his case, namely in WP(C) No. 648 of 2025, where it had been stated that the Ombudsman was relied upon as an internal/alternate mechanism for redressal of disputes, a position he asserts was recorded by this Court in its order dated 18.12.2025.

3. The learned Senior counsel then submits that the meeting conducted on 09.05.2026, cannot form a legal basis for placing the Ombudsman's appointment in abeyance, inasmuch as, the notice dated 06.05.2026, was issued without the President concurrence in violation of Rule 18(c)(iv) of the MCA constitution, which objected to by the President by notice dated 07.05.2026, and that inspite of the order of the Ombudsman dated

VERDICTUM.IN

08.05.2026, for suspension of the notice, the meeting nevertheless proceeded on 09.05.2026. In this meeting it is submitted, Rule 30(b) of the MCA constitution was not adhered to, inasmuch as, requirement of at least 5 members including 2, who are not office bearers was not met, and as such, therefore the purported resolution including the attempt to place the Ombudsman's appointment in abeyance cannot be sustained. It is further argued that the subsequent conduct on 07.09.2026, compounds the problem as the respondents No. 2-5, conveyed a meeting style as a Requisitioned Emergent Apex Council Meeting without informing or inviting the President, and that though the Minutes themselves acknowledged the pendency of proceedings before this Court, concerning the meeting of 09.05.2026, yet notwithstanding the knowledge proceeded and continued to act in continuation thereof, even though the Resolutions and consequential actions were already the subject matter of the interim order dated 01.07.2026. It is then submitted that the respondents by their own conduct showed that they understood the purport of the interim order dated 01.07.2026, to be subsisting and binding, and as such, their further action was therefore not dependent upon whether the respondent No. 1, personally convened attended or signed the proceedings of 07.09.2026. As such he submits, the meeting of 07.09.2026, cannot be treated as a lawful exercise,

VERDICTUM.IN

and that the conduct of all the persons who participated in the meeting is a clear and deliberate attempt to obstruct the cause of justice.

4. On the issue of suspension, the learned Senior counsel submits that the suspension dated 27.06.2026, was an immediate and administrative measure taken by the President, in the circumstances then prevailing and not a final adjudication, inasmuch as, the disciplinary issues were then placed before the Ombudsman on 01.07.2026, and show cause issued thereon on 06.07.2026. The allegation of violation of natural justice, therefore he submits, is premature, as the respondents have been afforded an opportunity to answer the allegations before a competent forum. On another aspect with regard to the allegation of suppression of Articles 3, 18 and 40 of the MCA constitution, the same has been stoutly denied and the learned Senior counsel has referred to submissions that have been video recorded by the Court, and has prayed that a transcript of the same be taken consideration.

5. In conclusion, the learned Senior counsel has reiterated his submissions that the Ombudsman was validly appointed and the meeting of 09.05.2026, cannot retrospectively erase the appointment, and that the constitutional process of the association cannot be reduced to a contest of which meeting is held last, and more importantly, nor can a subsisting order of this Court be rendered ineffective by the passing of a fresh resolution. The MCA constitution it is contended must govern, as also the order of this Court,

VERDICTUM.IN

and as such, WP(C) No. 294 of 2026 deserves to be allowed and the writ petitions filed by the respondents be disallowed by this Court.

6. Mr. A.K. Bhuyan, learned Senior counsel assisted by Dr. P.P. Medhi, learned counsel on behalf of the petitioners (Honorary Secretary and two others) in WP(C) No. 321 of 2026, and Respondents in WP (C) No. 294 of 2026, in reply has submitted that the Respondent No. 1 in his capacity, as Honorary Secretary of the MCA had issued notices to the members to attend the 26th Apex Council Meeting on 07.03.2026, which was held under the Chairmanship of the President i.e. the petitioner in WP(C) No. 294 of 2026. In this meeting he submits, the President forcefully tried to bypass the rules and guidelines laid down in the Memorandum of Association of the MCA, and the guidelines of the Lodha Committee recommendations, and proposed that without holding an Annual General Meeting the Association should proceed with the appointment of Hon'ble Justice (Retd.) Mr. B. D. Agarwal as the Ombudsman of the MCA, in spite of the objections raised by the petitioner (Honorary Secretary). This was followed he submits, by the proposal letter dated 09.03.2026, to Justice (Retd.) Mr. B. D. Agarwal as the Ombudsman, and that even though they approached the President for reconsideration of the decision, the same was refused and as such, he as Honorary Secretary, issued a letter to all the members requesting them to

VERDICTUM.IN

attend an Emergent Apex Council Meeting on 09.05.2026 to discuss the proposals made in the last Apex Council Meeting.

7. In the said meeting held on 09.05.2026 the Learned Senior counsel submits that it was decided that Rule 25(b)(vi) and Rule 40 of the Constitution of the MCA should be followed and that the Ombudsman shall be appointed at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) of the MCA, and as no AGM had been held the proposal of appointment of the Ombudsman by the Apex Council required reconsideration. In pursuance to this resolution, it is submitted a letter was then issued on 14.05.2026 to Hon'ble Justice (Retd.) Mr. B. D. Agarwal apprising him about the decision in the meeting held on 09.05.2026. Thereafter he submits, on a request by the office bearers of several District Cricket Associations of Meghalaya requesting for convening of a Special General Meeting, in response thereto, as per the rules, the petitioner vide letter dated 26.06.2026, then issued a notice for the conduct of an Emergent Apex Council Meeting on 27.06.2026. In the said meeting he submits a unanimous decision was taken for convening a Special General Meeting on 03.07.2026, wherein the issue of appointment of the Ombudsman would be addressed, but that however after the said meeting on 27.06.2026, the President issued the suspension notice dated 28.06.2026, suspending the petitioner (Honorary Secretary) by misinterpreting an order passed by the Meghalaya State Women's Commission dated 26.06.2026, and

VERDICTUM.IN

further also suspended the proposed Special General Meeting scheduled to be held on 03.07.2026.

8. It is then contended that a bare reading of the MSCW order dated 26.06.2026, would show that it only contained directions to immediately comply with the provisions of the POSH Act, and for setting up of an Internal Complaints Committee (ICC), and nowhere it is mentioned that the petitioner be suspended. It is further submitted that the important question in this matter, however is whether the appointment of the Ombudsman is valid, or in contravention of the Memorandum of Association and Rule 5(a) of the interpretation clause, wherein Apex Council has been defined and also Rule 12, with regard to the composition and functions of the Governing Body. The Learned Senior counsel has taken this Court through these provisions and submits that a conjoint reading, would show that the President/Respondents never followed the aforementioned provisions in convening the Emergent Apex Council Meeting on 07.03.2026, for appointment of the Ombudsman and as such therefore, the calling of a Special General Meeting by the petitioner vide the notice dated 27.06.2026, to address the issue of appointment of Ombudsman was perfectly valid. However he submits, on a misrepresentation this court by order dated 01.07.2026, the said meeting was suspended.

VERDICTUM.IN

9. In this context, the Learned Senior counsel has submitted that the interim order was passed without taking into consideration the following material facts namely: -

(a) The Apex Council Meeting held on 07.03.2026, was not authorised to appoint the Ombudsman, inasmuch as, Rule 25 (b)(vi) and Rule 40(1) mandates that the Ombudsman shall be appointed at the AGM of the MCA.

(b) The draft of the minutes of the Meeting held on 07.03.2026, with regard to all the agendas was prepared unilaterally by the President and that the presence of the Petitioner and other members in the meeting does not imply the consent for the official appointment of the Ombudsman who should have been appointed by the AGM.

10. The Learned Senior counsel has then reiterated his submissions that the interim order of this court which directed that the Ombudsman continue to discharge his functions as per the MCA Constitution till the next date was occasioned, due to the wrong contention of the President that the Ombudsman was appointed by the Apex Council Meeting held on 07.03.2026. In the landmark decision in the case of ***BCCI vs. Bihar Cricket Association (2015) 3 SCC 251***, it is submitted that the Supreme Court on the appointment of an Ombudsman has directed that the appointment was to be

VERDICTUM.IN

at the AGM, for the purpose of providing an independent dispute resolution mechanism. In the instant case he asserts that the President of the MCA, has acted arbitrarily in appointing the Ombudsman by illegally ignoring the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. As such, he submits the principles of Rule of Law and Due Process have been violated by the President, who has acted in gross contravention of the rules and regulations of the MCA, interference is called for by this court and WP(C) No. 294 of 2026, be dismissed.

11. Mr. S. Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner in WP(C) No. 377 of 2026, has submitted that the impugned suspension order suspending the Petitioner from the office of Honorary Secretary is wholly without jurisdiction, as the purported reason is the recommendation of the MSCW (Respondent No. 3 herein) inasmuch as, under Rule 41(b) any complaint received against a member or administrator, is required to be placed before the Apex Council which is to examine whether a prima facie case exists. In the instant case he submits Rule 41(b) has been completely bypassed and the complaint by the Respondent no. 3, was never placed before the Apex Council, no show-cause issued or decision or resolution taken to initiate disciplinary proceedings. The President he submits, acted unilaterally and on 01.07.2026, had also addressed a letter to the Ombudsman seeking initiation of proceedings against the petitioner on the basis of the

findings/recommendations of the MSCW, which is contrary to the applicable rules of the MCA. The action of the President he submits, in exercise of his powers under clause 18(a) has also acted in excess of jurisdiction as the said provision, merely empowers the President to exercise general supervision over the affairs of the association and, in cases of emergency, to take such measures as may be deemed necessary to safeguard the interest of the association. It is further submitted, this provision neither expressly nor by necessary implication confers upon the President any independent authority to suspend an elected office bearer or to bypass the disciplinary mechanism under Rule 41(b). Learned counsel concludes by contending that the impugned suspension order being illegal is liable to be set aside and quashed.

12. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and examining the materials, the main issues that arise for determination is the validity of the appointment of the Ombudsman, and whether the Apex Council's Ratification of the appointment on 07.03.2026, is sustainable, without adherence to Rule 40 of the MCA Rules, requiring appointment by the AGM. Further issue is whether the unilateral suspension of the Honorary Secretary is valid under the emergency powers exercised by the President by bypassing Rule 41(b), which outlines the disciplinary proceedings requiring prima facie findings by the Apex Council. Other points that have arisen for consideration is the legality of the Special General Meeting notice, and consequent meeting

VERDICTUM.IN

dated 07.09.2026, in the face of interlocutory orders operating, and also the disputed resignation letter of the Honorary Secretary, brought on record by MC(WPC) No. 238 of 2026, of his Presidentship from Ri Bhoi District Cricket Association. In the same Misc. Case, matters of financial mismanagement, the respondent No. 1's refusal to execute the bank signatory resolution, and retention of digital credentials and official email have also been raised. This Court has also noted the fact that the findings of the Meghalaya State Commission for Women (MSCW), framed against the BCCI's zero tolerance policy, had triggered the current crisis, which has exposed the failure of the MCA, with regard to the safety and protection of the female players.

13. On the validity of the Ombudsman's appointment as noted earlier, the same which was ratified on 07.03.2026, by the 26th Apex Council Meeting, the records would show that the meeting was held pursuant to a notice dated 03.03.2026, signed by the Honorary Secretary, which placed the subject matter of appointment of the Ombudsman before the said meeting. The minutes of the said 26th Apex Council Meeting, also specifically records the decision of the appointment of Ombudsman, and as such, the allegation that the appointment was forcefully imposed cannot be accepted, at this stage.

14. Another aspect that is relevant and duly noted by this Court, is that in the earlier round of litigation namely WP(C) No. 648 of 2025, it was

VERDICTUM.IN

recorded that an Ombudsman existed as an alternate dispute forum within the MCA, and the Honorary Secretary was a party respondent in the said case, and at that point of time, had not questioned the validity of the said office. Though, the regulations provide that the appointment of the Ombudsman is to be by the AGM, as per Rule 25(b)(vi) and Rule 40, thereof, the Honorary Secretary's and other members challenge, in the opinion of this Court is flawed by their own conduct, inasmuch as, they had participated in the meeting, and further the offer letter dated 09.03.2026, was issued and accepted by the Ombudsman, whose appointment was also communicated to the BCCI on 10.03.2026, which was to the knowledge of the Honorary Secretary and others. The proceedings thereafter, initiated in the meeting dated 09.05.2026, for placing the Ombudsman's appointment in abeyance, also cannot be held to be valid, as the notice dated 06.05.2026, calling for the same was issued without the President's concurrence, although Rule 18(c)(iv) of the MCA constitution, requires the same, and it is noted that the President in this regard had also lodged an objection dated 07.05.2026. Added to this fact, is that the 09.05.2026 meeting lacked the required quorum, as per Rule 30(b), which stipulates that at least 2 non-office bearers be present, whereas, the meeting consisted of only 5 office bearers.

15. This Court by an interim order dated 01.07.2026, passed in WP(C) No. 294 of 2026, had directed that the Ombudsman continue to discharge his

VERDICTUM.IN

functions in accordance with the MCA Constitution until the next date, and this interim order is still subsisting. As observed earlier, though the appointment is strictly not in accordance with the MCA Constitution, the intervening events however, has compelled this Court to appreciate other aspects that have to be taken into consideration and therefore, cannot confine itself only to the clinical challenge made to the Ombudsman's appointment. An important aspect in this regard are the grounds put up by the President who has asserted the validity of the Ombudsman's appointment and also the legality of the Honorary Secretary's suspension, as a mandatory emergency measure under Rule 18(a) to comply with the POSH mandate as directed by the MSCW, which had by 2(two) successive orders directed for disciplinary action, following findings of sexual harassment. This to the mind of the Court, in the interest of justice and transparency, cannot be ignored, coupled further with the fact that the BCCI requires State affiliates to maintain a functional dispute resolution mechanism (Ombudsman) and work place safety (ICC) framework.

16. In this chain of events, it is therefore, important to note that prior to the orders of the MSCW, the Honorary Secretary had no quarrel with the manner of appointment of the Ombudsman, and in fact also endorsed the same in an earlier writ petition and it is only after the MSCW's orders that the challenge materialized. Coming to the impugned suspension of the

VERDICTUM.IN

Honorary Secretary by the President under Rule 18(a) in the considered view of this Court on examination of the said Rule, which empowers the President to take all measures in an emergency to safeguard the Association, the action cannot be said to be arbitrary, but more of an interim administrative measure and not a final decision. Though Rule 41(b), speaks of final disciplinary proceedings requiring the Apex Council's prima facie finding, the suspension of the Honorary Secretary as an emergency measure, has to be looked at in the light of the POSH Act, 2013, wherein Section 12 thereof, mandates immediate steps to be taken by the employer (herein MCA) to prevent a hostile work environment and provides for a temporary measure to defuse it while the enquiry is underway. It would not be out of place to mention that the MSCW's Order No. 522 dated 26.06.2026, had noted a deliberate cover up by the Honorary Secretary, of suppression of official complaints e-mails from December, 2025, and therefore, the President's duty of care under Rule 18(a), justifies the interim suspension to protect the evidence and the complainants, while the formal disciplinary enquiry was referred to the Ombudsman. This Court therefore, finds that for the reasons discussed on the accompanying facts, the suspension was a valid interim measure.

17. On the other issue i.e. the legality of the Special General Meeting Notice and the 07.09.2026 meeting, without elaborating, suffice it to say that

VERDICTUM.IN

the resolutions arrived at, were taken while stay orders issued by this Court were in effect. This Court by order dated 01.07.2026, passed in MC(WPC) No. 194 of 2026, had suspended the respondent's decision to convene a meeting on 07.09.2026, which however was not paid heed to, and as such the said Meeting which was ostensibly held for administrative necessity for Cricket trials, is nothing but an attempt to subvert the orders of this Court as the suspension of the Honorary Secretary was revoked and the appointment of the Ombudsman sought to be by-passed. As such, all resolutions arrived at in the 07.09.2026 meeting are non-est in law.

18. Coming to the other issues that have arisen which had been brought on record in MC(WPC) No. 238 of 2026, with regard to the holding of dual office by the Honorary Secretary as the President of the Ri-Bhoi District Cricket Association, though an unverified resignation letter dated 22.12.2025, has been produced, this Court will not dwell upon this aspect except to note that Article 14.5 of the MCA Constitution provides for mandatory disqualification, if a member of the Apex Council once elected holds any office in an affiliate member Association. Should the resignation letter be verified, to be unaccepted and it be established that the Honorary Secretary continued to exercise executive powers as the Ri-Bhoi District Cricket Association even after being elected, by operation of Article 14.5 of

VERDICTUM.IN

the MCA Constitution, he would be rendered constitutionally disqualified from continuing as Honorary Secretary of the MCA.

19. The other issues raised in the said MC(WPC) No. 238 of 2026, with regard to the Honorary Secretary's refusal to execute the bank signatory resolution passed at the 26th Apex Council Meeting and his conduct thereafter, retention of digital credential and the official e-mail account are also under a cloud of doubt, as executive suspension divests an official of operational authority, more so, when the suspension order dated 27.06.2026, had directed for the immediate surrender of all physical and digital properties, access credentials and records, to the office of the President.

20. In the foregoing circumstances and on the facts of the case and the discussions made hereinabove, this Court orders as follows: -

i) WP(C) No. 294 of 2026 stands allowed, and the Special General Meeting Notice dated 27.06.2026, is declared invalid and the resolutions of the 09.05.2026, and 07.09.2026, are declared illegal and non-est in law.

ii) WP(C) No. 321 of 2026 challenging the appointment of the Ombudsman, by the Honorary Secretary is not entertained in view of the peculiar surrounding facts and circumstances.

VERDICTUM.IN

iii) WP(C) No. 377 of 2026 challenging the suspension of the Honorary Secretary stands dismissed and order of suspension dated 27.06.2026, upheld.

iv) The Ombudsman's appointment in view of the circumstances, shall be treated as functional *de facto* until the matter is taken up in the next AGM for necessary process.

v) The Honorary Secretary on his suspension being upheld and other respondents shall ensure assets handover within a period of 2(two) weeks from the date of this order, including digital credentials, e-mail identity etc.

vi) The MCA is directed to ensure strict implementation of the POSH Act, 2013, and to put in place safety protocols within the shortest possible period, preferably within 6(six) weeks from the date of this order.

21. As ordered above, these writ petitions are accordingly closed and disposed of.

Judge

Meghalaya
30.10.2026
"D.Thabah-PS"