

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

WP(C) No. 100 of 2025

Moreh Imphal Jeep and Tata Sumo Taxi
Service Welfare Association

.....*Petitioner/s*

- Versus -

State of Manipur & 3 Ors.

.... *Respondent/s*

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA

Order

05.02.2025

[1] Heard Mr. N. Rendy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. S. Niranjana, learned G.A. for the State respondent.

[2] The petitioner earlier submitted a representation dated 16.04.2023 to the Principal Secretary/Commissioner/Secretary (Home), Government of Manipur for payment of compensation for burning down of two vehicles of members of the association in Imphal-Moreh highway. Since the representation was not disposed of, the petitioner approached this Court by way of writ petition being WP(C) No. 487 of 2023 and vide order dated 06.07.2023, this Court disposed of the writ petition by directing respondent No. 2 i.e. Deputy Commissioner, Tengnoupal to pass a suitable speaking order on the representation dated 16.04.2023.

[3] In pursuance to the direction of this Court, the Deputy Commissioner, Tengnoupal passed an order dated 25.10.2024 rejecting the representation has not maintainable and devoid of merit. Against this order, the petitioner approached this Court with the present writ petition, inter-alia, praying for directing respondent No. 1 to pass a speaking order.

[4] At this stage, Mr. S. Niranjan, learned G.A., draws the attention of this Court to the order dated 06.07.2023 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 487 of 2023 whereby the Deputy Commissioner, Tengnoupal was directed to pass a speaking order on the representation dated 16.04.2023 submitted by the petitioner and by the impugned order dated 25.10.2024, the Deputy Commissioner, Tengnoupal rejected the representation by a speaking order.

[5] Since the direction of this Court issued vide order dated 06.07.2023 has already been complied by the Deputy Commissioner, Tengnoupal, no cause is survived for the disposal of the representation.

[6] Mr. M. Rendy, learned counsel for the petitioner, clarifies that the representation dated 16.04.2023 was addressed to the Principal Secretary/Commissioner/Secretary (Home), Government of Manipur and not to the Deputy Commissioner, Tengnoupal.

[7] Learned G.A. also draws the attention of this Court to an order dated 08.11.2024 passed by this Court in contempt case being Contempt Case (C) No. 16 of 2024 with respect to WP(C) No. 487 of 2023 and the same was withdrawn vide order dated 08.11.2024.

[8] This Court has perused the materials on record and heard the submissions made at the bar. It is an admitted fact that the representation dated 16.04.2023 was addressed to the Administrative Secretary (Home), Government of Manipur. However in the order dated 06.07.2023 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 487 of 2023 with respect to the same representation, the same was disposed of on the submissions of both the parties with a direction to respondent No. 2 i.e. DC, Tengnoupal to dispose of the representation by a speaking order and in compliance of the direction.

[9] Today, during the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that representation was addressed to the Administrative Secretary (Home), Government of Manipur and not to the Deputy Commissioner, Tengnoupal.

[10] The petitioner ought to approach the Ld. Single Judge for modifying the direction issued to respondent No. 2. However, the contempt case was filed for non-compliance of the order dated 06.07.2023.

[11] Upon filing of the contempt case and its subsequently withdrawn, this Court cannot accept that respondent No. 1 is the authority to dispose of the representation. Accordingly, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition, the writ petition is dismissed.

[12] The petitioner, if so advised, may approach appropriate forum agitating their grievances.

JUDGE

Kh. Joshua Maring