2025:MHC:42

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL

CRP(C.R.P Art.227) No.14 of 2025
With
MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)No.17 of 2025

Kshetrimayum Joy Singh aged about 57 years S/o Late. Ksh. Khongnem Meitei of Kakching Sumak Leikai, PO & PS Kakching District Kakching, Manipur.

Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Manipur, represented by the Secretary, Land Resources, Govt. of Manipur.

Respondent

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. D. KRISHNAKUMAR
O R D E R
(Oral)

04.04.2025

[1] MR. Arunkumar Singh, learned counsel, appears for the petitioner and Mr. RK Umakanta, learned Sr. GA, appears for the State respondent.

[2] By the consent of both the parties, the Civil Revision petition is taken up for disposal.

[3] According to the petitioner, he has filed Revenue Revision case being No.16 of 2024 before the Revenue Tribunal, Thoubal on 03.08.2024 challenging against the impugned notice issued by SDO, Kakching dated 30.07.2024 for eviction and on the same day, the said notice of the SDO Kakching was stayed till further order. The petitioner came to know that the Revenue Revision case No.16 of 2024 which was kept in abeyance on 26.09.2024 by the learned Presiding Officer Revenue Tribunal till the disposal of revenue Misc. case No.42 of 2024 was heard on

2025:MNHC:72

20.01.2025 and the same was dismissed on default thereby cancelling the stay order dated 03.08.2024. The Revenue misc. case No.42 of 2024 was heard on 29.01.2025 and fixed another date on 05.03.2024 for written objection and hearing as mentioned earlier. The petitioner filed an application for restoration of the Revenue Revision case No.16 of 2024 on 10.02.2025 and the same was restored on 10.02.2025 but the Presiding Officer Revenue Tribunal, Thoubal did not restore the interim order dated 03.08.2024 and also pre-pond the date of hearing of the Revenue Misc. case No.42 of 2024 which was earlier heard on 29.01.2025 and fixed on 05.03.2025 for written objection and hearing. Further, according to the petitioner, the same Revenue Misc. Case No. 42 of 2024 which was earlier fixed on 05.03.2025 was advanced on 21.02.2025 along with Revenue case No. 16 of 2024.

[4] According to the petitioner, the restoration application filed by the petitioner was allowed in Revenue Revision case No.16 of 2024 and by the application filed for restoring interim order, the Revenue Tribunal has granted interim order till the next date of hearing and posted the matter on 05.03.2025 but subsequently, it was put up on 21.02.25 for hearing. Challenging the aforesaid order for restricting the interim order, the revision petitioner has filed the present instant revision petition before this Court. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that no prejudice will be caused to the respondent if the said interim order is extended till the disposal of the revision petition in Revenue Revision Case No.16 of 2024. Therefore, in such circumstances, he seeks that revision petition filed by the petitioner may be allowed.

[5] Mr. RK Umakanta, learned Sr. GA appearing for the respondents would submit that the said revision petition in Revenue case No.16 of 2024 is still pending

2025:MNHC:72

before the Tribunal but the petitioner is delaying the matter by filing the present Civil Revision petition before this Court and therefore, he seeks that appropriate order may be passed by directing the learned Tribunal to dispose of the Revenue Revision case No.16 of 2024 within a stipulated period of time.

[6] Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and for the ends of justice, this Court is inclined to pass the following orders:

(a) The order passed by the Tribunal dated 10.02.2025 restricting the interim order till 21.02.2025 is extended until further order till the disposal revision petition.

(b) The Revenue Tribunal is directed to dispose of the Revenue Revision case No.16 of 2024 on its own merits and in accordance with law, preferably within a period 3(three) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(c) Further, the Tribunal is to take appropriate decision in the impleadment application filed by the third party.

[7] With the above directions, the present Civil Revision petition is disposed of. Consequently, misc. case is also stands closed.

CHIEF JUSTICE

John Kom