

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

**WP(C) No. 223 of 2026 with
MC(WP(C)) No. 243 of 2026**

Md Shabir Ahmed and 22 Ors.

... *Petitioners*

- *Versus* -

State of Manipur and 3 Ors.

... *Respondents*

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

ORDER

24.03.2026

[1] Heard Mr. Ajoy Pebam, learned counsel for the petitioners.

[2] The 23 petitioners are the Fair Price Shop Agents/ S.K. Oil Sub-Dealer for Imphal East District for shop nos. from 89 to 111 in terms of the order dated 15.07.2024 issued by DC cum Chairperson, Imphal East for a term of 1(one) year from 01.04.2024 to 31.03.2025 and their term has been extended for another period w.e.f. 01.10.2025 to 31.03.2026. Thereafter, Chairperson of the Selection & Appointment Committee of FPS Agents/DC, Imphal East issued a notification dated 10.02.2026 notifying for selection of Fair Price shop agents cum S.K. Oil Sub-Dealers. In the writ petition, it is prayed not to give effect to notification dated 10.02.2026 till payment of pending honorarium w.e.f. 01.04.2024.

[3] During the course of hearing, Mr. Ajoy Pebam, learned counsel for the petitioners, on instruction submits that the petitioners are not pressing the main relief prayed for and the writ petition may be disposed of at this stage by directing the respondents especially Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East and District Supply Officer, Imphal East to consider the 2(two) representations both dated 18.03.2026 submitted by the petitioners for payment of honorarium by a speaking order within a stipulated time. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the prayer for disposal of the writ petition by considering

the pending representations both dated 18.03.2026 is not a part of the prayer in the main petition and he has been especially instructed by the petitioners to make this alternate oral plea.

[5] Mr. Th. Sukumar, learned GA for the State respondents submits that the petitioners have mixed-up relief prayed for in the writ petition. It is pointed out that the claim for due honorarium is one thing and it has no connection to the new notification dated 10.02.2026. However, the learned GA for the State respondents submits that this Court may pass appropriate order by considering the alternate oral plea made by the learned counsel for the petitioners for payment of honorarium without prejudice to the right of the State and without expressing any opinion on the legality of the notification dated 10.02.2026 issued by the respondent no. 3.

[6] This Court has considered the alternate oral plea made by the learned counsel for the petitioners and it is of the view that the writ petition may be disposed of at this stage.

[7] Accordingly, the WP(C) No. 223 of 2026 is disposed of by directing respondent no. 3, i.e. Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East/ Chairperson of the Selection & Appointment Committee of FPS Agents, Imphal East and respondent no. 4, i.e. District Supply Officer, Imphal East to consider the pending representations both dated 18.03.2026 submitted by the petitioners for payment of honorarium by a speaking order as per applicable rules within a period of 2(two) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

[8] It is made clear that this Court does not express any opinion on the merit of the case.

[9] The MC(WP(C)) No. 243 of 2026 is also disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE

Thoiba