

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

CONT. CAS (C) No. 140 of 2018

All Manipur Small Scale Industrialists Association

Petitioner

Vs.

T. Ranjit Singh, IAS; & Ors.

Respondents

***Clubbed with
MC [CONT. CAS (C)] No. 111 of 2022***

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. KEMPAIAH SOMASHEKAR
(ORDER)

10.07.2025

[1] Learned senior counsel for the complainant/petitioner, Mr. M. Devananda is present before the Court physically; Learned Advocate General, Manipur, Mr. Lenin Hijam is also present before the Court physically; and respondent No. 4, Secretary (Revenue) Government of Manipur, is also present before the Court physically as per order dated 19.06.2025.

[2] This contempt petition has been initiated by the complainant/petitioner keeping in view the provision of Article 215 of the Constitution of India read with Section 11 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and whereby seeking for initiation of contempt proceeding against the respondents for willful violation of the order rendered by the learned Single Judge on the writ side in W.P. (C) No. 387 of 2014 dated 06.04.2017.

[3] Whereas in the aforesaid writ petition, W.P. (C) No. 387 of 2024, the petitioner sought for setting aside the impugned cancellation order dated 23.05.2014 issued by the Under Secretary (Revenue), Government of Manipur, in respect to the petitioner association allotment land under Patta No. 279 (Old), 841 (New) corresponding to CS Dag No. 2601 measuring an area of 6.0705 hectares Village No. 3 – Dibong.

[4] The writ petition came to be allowed in favour of the petitioner *vide* order dated 06.04.2017 rendered by the learned Single Judge on the writ side by setting aside the cancellation order dated 23.05.2014 passed by the Under Secretary (Revenue), Government of Manipur.

[5] Whereas learned Advocate General, Mr. Lenin Hijam, submits that subsequent to the orders rendered by the learned Single on the writ side in W.P. (C) No. 387 of 2014, the original records relating to allotment of that land was intact. However, a writ appeal, being W.A. No. 57 of 2018 has been preferred and the same is pending before the Division Bench of this Court.

This status which is submitted by the learned Advocate General in this matter is taken on record.

[6] However, this contempt petition has been initiated by the complainant/petitioner seeking intervention for disobedience of the order rendered by the learned Single Judge in the aforesaid writ petition dated 06.04.2017.

[7] These are all the status submitted by the learned Advocate General, Manipur for the respondent/accused inclusive of the learned senior counsel for the petitioner/complainant, M. Devananda in this contempt proceeding.

[8] In the meanwhile of contentious contentions, learned Advocate General, Manipur, further submits that when once the order of cancellation was set aside by the learned Single Judge on the writ side, there is no need to issue administrative order.

This submission which is made by the learned Advocate General, Manipur is also taken on record.

[9] Learned Advocate General, Manipur, emphatically refers to a judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India reported in the case of **Om Prakash Verma and others Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh** reported in **(2010) 13 SCC 158**, whereas in para 63, an observation has been made that it is well settled by a catena of decisions of this Court that once a decision of the High Court is set aside by this Court, it ceases to exist. It falls on all four corners and it is not open to contend subsequently that a particular aspect or argument was not considered by this Court or that it can be relied upon.

[10] Learned Advocate General, Manipur, in this matter submits that subsequent to the orders rendered by the learned Single on the writ side in W.P. (C) No. 387 of 2014, the original records relating to allotment of that land was intact. However, the proceeding in W.A. No. 57 of 2018

is pending consideration of the issues relating to order dated 06.04.2017 rendered by the learned Single Judge in W.P. (C) No. 387 of 2014.

Accordingly, made an observation.

[11] Therefore, at this stage, it does not arise for dwelling in detail about this contempt petition and keeping in view the facts and circumstances are concerned, it is deemed appropriate that this contempt proceeding is hereby closed.

Consequently, MC [CONT. CAS (C)] No. 111 of 2022 is also closed.

Sandeep

CHIEF JUSTICE