

JOHN
TELEN KOM

Digitally signed by
JOHN TELEN KOM
Date: 2025.09.11
16:23:27 +07'00'

Sl. No.5

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

CONT.CAS(C) No.98 of 2024

Potsangbam Victoria Devi

Petitioner/s

Vs.

Raju Das and Anr.

Respondent/s

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. KEMPAIAH SOMASHEKAR

(ORDER)

03.09.2025.

The learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Rustom is present before the Court physically. Similarly, Mr. Sarvan Kumar, learned counsel for the respondent No.2 & 3 is also present before the Court physically.

This contempt proceeding has been initiated by the complainant/petitioner for disobedience of the order dated 06.09.2022 in WP(C) No.631 of 2021 and therefore, seeking for

The learned counsel namely Mr. Rustam for the complainant/petitioner is present on behalf of his senior advocate Mr. Th. Tarunkumar who is on record whereas the learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3 also submitted that the respondent No.1 who is in the rank of the parties has been deleted vide order dated 15.11.2024 and he further submitted in this matter that proceeding in WP(C) No.631 of 2021 had been disposed of on 06.09.2022 but subsequently, an appeal was

preferred by the appellant as being a aggrieved party in W.A. No.9 of 2023 and later on, the aforesaid writ appeal was withdrawn on 10.06.2024 with liberty to initiate the review petition, subsequently, the initiation of review petition i.e., MC(Review. Petn.) No.20 of 2024 and aforesaid review petition came to be dismissed on 05.06.2025.

It is further submitted that on the dismissal of the review petition on the premises that it cannot arise for the condonation of delay. Thereafter, the writ appeal preferred by the appellant in W.A. No.31 of 2025 and this writ appeal preferred by the appellant relating challenging the order rendered by the learned Single Judge on the writ side in WP(C) No.631 of 2021. However, it is clarified that the aforesaid writ appeal is pending before the Division Bench having the jurisdiction to deal with this matter whereas the learned counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3 in further submitted that this contempt case is initiated for disobedience of order rendered by the learned Single Judge on writ side in WP(C) No.631 of 2021 dated 06.09.2022, even after recording the period of initiation of the contempt proceeding that there is a barred by limitation for the period of around 2 years and this submission made by the learned counsel for the respondent No.2 & 3 is taken on record.

However, this contempt petition has been initiated by the complainant/petitioner for seeking intervention in terms of disobedience of the order rendered by the learned single judge on the writ side in the aforesaid order dated 06.09.2022. In the given paculier facts and circumstances are concerned, it is deemed appropriate to refer the provision of Section 20 of contempt of Court act, 1971, it revealed that

In so far as the issues in between the parties are concerned, section 20 of court of contempt act..... relating to the disobedience of the order but the keeping in view the provision of section 20 of Court of contempt act, 1971 are concerned, it is does not survive for consideration.

Therefore, this contempt petition is hereby dismissed.

However, the learned counsel for the complainant/petitioner requested that some liberty may be granted And therefore, on the premises, liberty is granted as sought for.

Accordingly, ordered.

Ab. Surjit

CHIEF JUSTICE