

OINAM
THOIBA MEITEI

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

Digitally signed by
OINAM THOIBA MEITEI
Date: 2025.08.11
17:28:19 +05'30'

**W.P. (C) No. 608 of 2025 with
MC(W.P. (C)) No. 571 of 2025**

Ahanthem Rohen Singh

... *Petitioner*

- *Versus* -

State of Manipur and 4 Ors.

... *Respondents*

**B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

ORDER

11.08.2025

[1] Heard Mr. T. Rajendra, learned sr. counsel assisted by Mr. Sh. Vikash Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. H. Devendra, learned Dy. AG assisted by Ms. I. Sharmila, learned jr. GA on behalf of the State respondents.

[2] The learned sr. counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in possession of piece of land in village no. 87(A) Khwai Bazar, under Patta no. 605/1365 covered by C.S. Dag No. XVII/239. Since, the area recorded in the Jamabandi was wrongly shown as 0.0250 Hectare, the petitioner requested authority for correction.

[3] Thereafter, the petitioner filed an application dated 12.07.2018 to the Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West for correction of land record under Section 41 of the MLR & LR Act, 1960. Vide order dated 22.10.2018, the D.C., Imphal West passed an order making necessary correction of the area as 0.0293 hectare, after proper field verification in place of 0.0250 hectare recorded earlier. Thereafter, in the new Jamabandi, the area of the occupation of the petitioner is shown as 0.0293 hectare.

[4] It is also pointed out that vide order dated 31.01.2020 passed by this Court in W.P. (C) No. 352 of 2017, it was observed that the State Authority shall adopt due process strictly under the law and proper demarcation followed by the principles of natural justice to uphold and preserve the Rule of law.

[5] The learned sr. counsel for the petitioner submits that a team of Revenue Department came to the premise of the petitioner on 06.08.2025 and made some red mark to the plot of the petitioner as encroachment and on 08.08.2025, the officials of the Revenue Department directed the petitioner to remove the alleged encroachment.

[6] The learned sr. counsel for the petitioner also submits that no demarcation has been done in terms of the earlier order passed in the year, 2020 and recently also, no demarcation has been initiated, so that area shown in the red mark can't be treated as encroachment by the petitioner.

[7] It is prayed that the property of the petitioner be protected from eviction and demolition without demarcation and proper verification.

[8] On the other hand, the learned Dy. AG for the State respondents submits that recently, State Government has initiated a mass drive for demarcation to ascertain any encroachment in public land and red markings are made by the Revenue Authority as preliminary process of the demarcation to ascertain the exact encroachment, if any. It is also stated that no eviction notice is issued to the petitioner as such, the cause of the present writ petition is premature.

[9] This Court has perused the material on records and also earlier order dated 31.01.2020 passed by this Court in W.P. (C) No. 352 of 2017, directing the State Authority to follow the due process of law and also demarcate before eviction.

[10] In the present case, there is no actual notice/ order of the eviction of the petitioner from the area red marked by the officials of Revenue Department.

[11] In the circumstances, the present W.P. (C) No. 608 of 2025 and MC(W.P. (C)) No. 571 of 2025 are disposed of by directing the State respondents to give

proper notice for demarcation and eviction before any demolition of the structure encroached upon the public land. Demolition shall be resorted after verifying the extent of encroachment on public land.

[12] Till then, status quo be maintained.

[13] Furnish a copy of this order to the learned counsel appearing for the parties in the course of the day by whatsapp or email.

JUDGE

Thoiba