

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR  
AT IMPHAL  
CRP (C.R.P. Art. 227) No. 57 of 2024**

Wahengbam Ranjit Singh @ Ajit Singh

***Petitioner***

**Vs.**

Wahengbam Premjit Singh

***Respondent***

**With  
MC [CRP (C.R.P. Art. 227)] No. 92 of 2024**

**BEFORE  
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. D. KRISHNAKUMAR**

**ORDER**

**17.01.2025**

Mr. Dayali Elangbam, learned counsel, appears for the petitioner;  
and Mr. L. Seityandra, learned counsel, appears for the respondent.

The present Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the  
impugned order dated 20.12.2024 passed by the Revenue Tribunal, Manipur, in  
Revenue Revision Case No. 70 of 2024.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondent  
herein had submitted an application on 12.03.2024 before the Deputy  
Commissioner, Imphal West and pursuant thereto, the SDO, Lamphel, registered  
an Eviction Case No. 8 of 2024 and the impugned order dated 13.09.2024 was  
passed therein without considering submission of the petitioner and thus, the  
petitioner has filed Revenue Revision Case No. 70 of 2024 before the Revenue  
Tribunal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the owner of the homestead land under Patta No. 144 (old), 118/586 (New) covered by C.S. Dag No. 39 measuring to an extent of 0.0296 hectare.

According to the petitioner, no proper and final demarcation was done between the petitioner and the respondent and no final peg was affixed nor memorandum was issued to the petitioner as claimed by the respondent in Demarcation Case No. 72/SDC/IW(C) dated 22.02.2018 and further the respondent has also filed another Demarcation Case No. 4/SDC/IW(C)-II dated 08.01.2024 and notice dated 13.02.2024 was issued to the petitioner by the SDC/IW(Central-II) which is still pending no memorandum was issued to the petitioner till date.

According to the petitioner, the Tribunal has relied upon memorandum dated 22.02.2018 in Demarcation Case No. 72/SDC/IW(C) which has been signed by the both the parties. Without considering the genuineness of the signature of the petitioner, the authority has rejected the claim of the petitioner, hence, he has filed the present revision petition before this Court.

Learned counsel for the respondent strongly objected that the said document has been forged, as signature of the parties are clearly found in the said document and now the petitioner cannot have a leg to stand by disputing the signature of the petitioner, which has been found in the Demarcation Case No. 72/SDC/IW(C). In such circumstance, he seeks for dismissal of the civil revision petition.

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the materials on record. Upon considering the submission made by the parties, the issue involved in the present revision petition is that whether the document which has been submitted by the respondent herein before the authority is fraudulent or otherwise.

According to the petitioner, the said document which has been filed before the authority is fraudulent document and without the knowledge of the petitioner, the signature of the petitioner is found in the said document. The Tribunal did not accept the said contention of the petitioner and the same is rejected.

Learned counsel for the respondent also strongly objected that the petitioner cannot have any right to make such a submission in the Eviction Case No. 8 of 2024 and therefore, the said contention has been rightly rejected by the authority. Learned counsel for the respondent also submitted that the present revision petition cannot be entertained as the petitioner's remedy is only before other forum and hence, he seeks for dismissal of the present revision petition.

Considering the submission made by the parties, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has been raising disputed question of fact before the concerned authority that the signature made in the document in Demarcation Case No. 72/SDC/IW(C) is not genuine one and that being so, the petitioner's remedy is only to be sought before the civil Court for appropriate relief.

In such circumstances, this civil revision petition cannot be entertained and consequently, the same is accordingly dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent civil court for his relief, if any.

The miscellaneous application also stands dismissed.

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

*Sandeep*