

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

**WP(C) No. 513 of 2025 with  
MC(WP(C) No. 492 of 2025**

D. Yongnyak Konyak

*.....Petitioner/s*

- Versus -

National Project Construction Corporation Limited & Anr.

*.... Respondent/s*

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

**Order**

**05.08.2025**

[1] Heard Mr. M. Gunedhor, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. Sanatomba, learned counsel for the respondent.

[2] The petitioner approached this Court by the present writ petition praying for setting aside the impugned letter dated 17.05.2025 issued by the respondent rejecting his request for consideration to revise the rate for contract.

[3] It may be pointed out that the petitioner made an undertaking before the Division Bench of this Court in the connected case i.e. WA Nos. 1 of 2023 & 2 of 2023 and MC(WA) No. 1 of 2023 where the petitioner undertook before the Division Bench that he was willing to execute the work at the rate of the 2017 and will not ask for any difference. However, the petitioner made a request vide letter dated 02.05.2025 for revision of the rate and the same was rejected by the letter dated 17.05.2025.

[4] When the matter was taken up for hearing motion, learned senior counsel for the respondent has pointed out that vakalatnama is filed by the petitioner but affidavit is shown by the

Power of Attorney and the copy of the same has not been annexed with the petition. Thereafter, the petitioner filed an additional affidavit dated 19.07.2025 bringing on record special Power of Attorney executed in the name of Mr. Kamei Thoiana. However, the signature of the petitioner in the Power of Attorney and in the vakalatnama are quite different and on 28.07.2025, the petitioner also appeared in person before this Court along with his counsel and submitted that he has two signatures, one appended in the vakalatnama and other in the Power of Attorney and filed an affidavit annexing two signatures and filed an affidavit dated 28.07.2025 with signature-I and signature-II. Signature-I is the one purportedly signed in the vakalatnama and Signature-II is purportedly signed in the special Power of Attorney.

[5] However, on comparing the two sample signatures filed by way of affidavit dated 28.07.2025 with the signatures in the vakalatnama and special Power of Attorney, the Signature-I seems to be similar with the signature appended in the vakalatnama. However, the sample Signature-II is quite different from the one appended in the Power of Attorney by the petitioner and this Court is of the view that it does not require sending the matter to the Forensic Science. On examination by a normal person, the sample Signature-II and signature in the Power of Attorney are quite different.

[6] Mr. M. Gunedhor, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the vakalatnama and special Power of Attorney are handed over to him by the petitioner and without any hesitation, the same has been filed before this Court. However, he has been instructed to withdraw the writ petition.

[7] On the other hand, Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel for the respondent, submits that he has no objection in withdrawing the writ petition but the matter regarding the signatures should be sent to the FSL, as the same has to be signed by the same person herein i.e. petitioner.

[8] This Court has perused the materials on record especially the signature in the vakalatnama, in the special Power of

Attorney and the sample signatures filed by the petitioner by way of additional affidavit before this Court.

[9] On plain examination, the signature in the Power of Attorney and the sample Signature-II are quite different and sending the matter to the FSL will be futile exercise.

[10] In the circumstances, writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. However, the matter in which the writ petition is filed by the petitioner is highly deprecated and expected that the same is not repeated in future.

[11] With this observation, writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. Misc. case is closed.

[12] This Court does not express any opinion regarding genuineness of the signature except for the apparent difference and issue is kept open.

**JUDGE**

*Kh. Joshua Maring*

KH.  
JOSHUA  
MARING

Digitally signed by  
KH. JOSHUA  
MARING  
Date: 2025.08.06  
10:19:52 +05'30'