

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

**WP(C) No. 75 of 2025 with
MC(WP(C) No. 423 of 2023 with
MC(WP(C) No. 91 of 2024 with
WP(C) No. 129 of 2024 with
WP(C) No. 145 of 2023 with
WP(C) No. 853 of 2023**

N.E. Logistic

.....Petitioner/s

- Versus -

State of Manipur & 3 Ors.

.... Respondent/s

**BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

Order

10.12.2025

[1] Present Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. Arunkumar, learned counsel for the petitioner in WP(C) No. 129 of 2024 (M/S Radhika Express Service), Mr. M. Gunedhor, learned counsel along with Mr. BR. Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner in WP(C) No. 853 of 2023 (N.E. Logistic) and Mr. L. Sevananda, learned counsel for the petitioner in WP(C) No. 145 of 2023 (M/S W.I. Enterprises. Also present Mr. S. Nepolean, learned Sr. counsel and G.A. assisted by Mrs. RK. Emily, learned Dy. G.A. for the State respondent in all these matters and Mr. N. Umakanta, learned senior counsel assisted by Ms. Daisy, learned counsel for the private respondent (M/S Transking Carrier Pvt. Ltd.).

[2] In all these writ petitions, the common question is the challenge of the award of contract granted to the private respondent i.e. M/S Transking Carrier Pvt. Ltd.) and M/S Soraisam Enterprises on

various grounds, especially the awardee quoted exceptionally low bid which is not commensurate as per the standard.

[3] It is submitted that M/S Soraisam Enterprises is not appearing in some of the cases before this Court. All the parties have agreed to one point that as on date, the award as well as extension of the award which is subject matter of WP(C) No. 75 of 2025 has become infructuous, as the term of contract award and the extension have already expired and the matter becomes academic importance.

[4] Mr. M. Gunedhor, learned counsel for the petitioner in WP(C) No. 75 of 2025, submits that in affidavit before the Hon'ble Supreme Court filed by the State respondent in Civil Appeal No. 6532 of 2021 and the connected misc. applications, it is stated that the reasonable rate is Rs. 7/-. However, in compliance affidavit, the award was given to private respondent i.e. M/S Transking Carrier Pvt. Ltd. at the rate below Rs. 7/-. Mr. S. Nepolean, learned G.A. explains that the same contention was raised before this Court and it was rejected by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the connected SLP and the writ appeal.

[5] In the circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that in keeping the contentions raised in these writ petitions keeping open, the writ petitions and the connected applications are disposed of as infructuous. However, taking into consideration the various grounds raised in the writ petitions (which have not been considered on merit in these writ petitions), it will be appropriate to make certain observations in order to avoid such eventuality in future. In view of the nature of allegations in these writ petitions, in future contract, the respondents especially Social Welfare Department shall consider strictly in the terms of the NIT and the applicable rules.

[6] In the circumstances, writ petitions and the misc. applications are closed as infructuous.


[7] Admittedly, the contract and the extension expired on 30.11.2025 and as on date, there is no authorized contractor for lifting of the essential items. Till the new contractors/transporters are engaged, the State Government especially Social Welfare Department is at liberty to make alternative arrangement and the bidders may also

file representations in this regard and such representations, if any, may be considered in accordance with law.

JUDGE

Kh. Joshua Maring

KH.
JOSHUA
MARING



Digitally signed
by KH. JOSHUA
MARING
Date: 2025.12.10
17:39:36 +05'30'