

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL**

Cont.Cas(C)No.54 of 2023

Ref: WP(C)No.21 of 2023

RK Rajen Singh

...Petitioner

- Versus -

DR. Sailesh Kumar Chourasia & 2 Ors.

...Respondents

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE M.V.MURALIDARAN
ORDER

11.10.2023

[1] Heard Mr. M. Rendy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr. U. Augusta, learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.2 & 3 and Mr. N. Zequeson, learned counsel appearing for the 1.

[2] Mr. M. Rendy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner represented that he has filed the presented contempt petition for non-compliance of the order dated 13.03.2023 passed by this Court in WP(C)No.21 of 2023 in which this Court has passed the order as follows:

"9. Considering the overall conspectus of the matter and the fact that the bills pertain to the works executed in the year 2012, to give a quietus to the matter, we dispose of the writ petition by directing the petitioner to give a fresh representation to the respondent authorities within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, enclosing all relevant documents,

including bills and vouchers and the authorization letter of the Deputy General Manager, Bishnupur Division, MSPDCL, dated 30.10.2017, and on receipt of the same, the respondent authorities are directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders to release the undisputed claim made by the petitioner within two weeks thereafter. The respondent authorities while considering the claim of the petitioner shall keep in mind the authorisation letter of the Deputy General Manager, Bishnupur Division, MSPDCL, dated 30.10.2017.”

[3] As per the order above order, the petitioner has submitted a representation dated 29.03.2023 but after issuance of notice in this contempt application, the respondents have filed an affidavit alongwith order dated 17.04.2023 by stating that the claim made by the petitioner was rejected but this Court, as per the order dated 13.03.2023 passed by this Court in WP(C)No.21 of 2023, directed the petitioner to send a representation within a period of 2(weeks) from the date of receipt of the order and on receipt of the same, the respondents were directed to pass orders within a period of 2(two) weeks thereafter.

[4] On perusal of the order dated 17.04.2023 passed by the respondent No.2, it is found that nothing has been mentioned about the representation dated 29.03.2023 sent by petitioner whereas Mr. U. Augusta, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 & 3 represented that the respondents have received the representation dated 29.03.2023 but no signature was found in the said representation.

[5] Admittedly as per the order dated 13.03.2023 passed by this Court in WP(C)No.21 of 2023, the respondents were directed to consider fresh representation to be submitted by the petitioner but the order dated 17.04.2023 passed by the respondent No.2 has mentioned nothing about the representation dated 29.03.2023. Therefore, the order dated 17.04.2023 is not a compliance of the Court's order dated 13.03.2023.

[6] Accordingly, the respondents are directed to pass appropriate order on the petitioner's representation dated 29.03.2023 within a period of 4(four) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

[7] With the above direction, this contempt application is closed.

ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

John Kom