

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

**MC(W.P. (C)) No. 858 of 2025**

Leishangthem Shamo Singh and 8 Ors.

.... Applicants

- Versus -

State of Manipur and 5 Ors.

.... Respondents

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

**ORDER**

26.11.2025

[1] Present Mr. L. Shyam, learned counsel for the applicants/ writ petitioners and Mr. H. Devendra, learned Dy. AG assisted by Ms. I. Sharmila, learned jr. Govt. counsel on behalf of the State respondents.

[2] In the main writ petition being W.P. (C) No. 931 of 2025, this Court issue notice and the learned Dy. AG prays for some time for filing counter affidavit.

[3] The learned counsel for the applicants prays for interim prayer directing the respondents not to disturb the positions of the writ petitioners till the disposal of the main writ petition.

[4] It is stated that the petitioners are inhabitants of the land under dispute for more than 60 years and they came to know only recently about the Office Memorandum dated 18.03.2019 issued by Divisional Forest Officer, Central Forest Division declaring the boundary of Langol Reserved Forests determined on the basis of Manipur State Darbar resolution no. 4 dated 02.11.1938.

[5] It is submitted that the petitioners came to know about the O.M. recently and it is also stated that the impugned O.M. is in violation of the Section

4-27 of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 as the authority framed to notify the same. It is also submitted that if the positions of the petitioners are not protected during the pendency of the writ petition, the very purpose of filing the writ petition will be frustrated.

[6]               The learned Dy. AG submits that the petitioners herein also filed W.P. (C) No. 885 of 2025 challenging the impugned O.M. dated 18.03.2019. Vide order dated 10.11.2025, this Court refused to pass any interim order in W.P. (C) No. 885 of 2025 filed by the same petitioners herein. Since, the subject matter of W.P. (C) No. 885 of 2025 and the main writ petition being W.P. (C) No. 931 of 2025 are same and the petitioners have not been evicted as apprehended before this Court. The learned Dy. AG submits that no interim order is required to pass at this stage to the petitioners.

[7]               The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in connected writ petition being W.P. (C) No. 1007 of 2019, this Court passed interim order protecting the positions of the petitioners therein.

[8]               This Court noted that the application for stay was rejected by this Court in vide order dated 10.11.2025 in W.P. (C) No. 885 of 2025 with MC(W.P. (C)) No. 815 of 2025 and the petitioners herein has not been evicted till now.

[9]               This Court is of the view that the apprehension of the petitioners of being evicted is not real. In the circumstances, this Court is not inclined to pass any interim order is passed at this stage and MC(W.P. (C)) No. 858 of 2025 is rejected.

[10]              List this case on 28.01.2026

**JUDGE**

*Thoiba*