

Suppl.-1, Sl. No. 1

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

MC(PIL) No. 12 of 2026

Ref:- PIL No. 10 of 2025

1. The State of Manipur, represented by the Chief Secretary, Government of Manipur, Mantripukhri, P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Heingnang, Manipur – 795002.
2. The Commissioner/Secretary, Rural Development & Panchayati Raj (RD&PR), Government of Manipur, Mantripukhri, P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Heingnang, Manipur- 795002.
3. The Chief Engineer (MSRRDA/RED), Government of Manipur, 4th Floor, Secured Office Building, AT-Line, near 2nd MR Gate, Kabo Leikai, P.O. Imphal & P.S. City, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

.....Applicants/Respondent in the PIL

Vs.

1. Mm Tajuddin, aged about 48 years, S/o Haji Nasib Ali, a resident of Lilong Haoreibi Awang Leikai, Lilong, P.O. & P.S. Lilong, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795130.
2. Shri Y. Thoiba Singh, Special Class Contractor, a resident of Thoubal Athokpam Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.

.....Respondents

BEFORE
**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

For the Applicants	Mr. Wahengbam Niranjit Singh, Deputy Government Advocate (State Counsel)
Date of Order	27.05.2026

ORDER

(M. Sundar, CJ)

[1] Captioned 'MC' ('Miscellaneous Case') has been filed seeking extension of time for implementation/completion *qua* an order dated 12.11.2025 made in PIL No. 10 of 2025 which reads as follows :

'Sl. Nos. 7-9

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

PIL No. 10 of 2025

MM Tajuddin

Petitioner

Vs.

State of Manipur and 3 others

Respondents

*Clubbed with MC(PIL) No. 16 of 2025
With MC(PIL) No. 27 of 2025*

BEFORE

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

ORDER

(Order of the court was made by M. Sundar, CJ)

12.11.2025

[1] Captioned main matter is a Public Interest Litigation (PIL). Subject matter of PIL is construction of what is known as 'Samurou Bailey Bridge' over Imphal River at 3.70 km (Samurou Bazar Mapa) under Thoubal block (hereinafter 'said work' for the sake of convenience and clarity).

[2] Mr. Mohamad Ajmal Hussain, learned counsel for the PIL petitioner submits that the PIL petitioner is concerned for the local populace/citizenry as the said work is to put in place a bridge which will serve as primary connectivity link for transportation, public conveyance and access to the local bazaar which is an essential hub for livelihoods, especially for farmers, traders and daily wage earners. Learned counsel also points out that the existing wooden bridge which is presently used by the public (owing to said work remaining incomplete) is in a dilapidated condition. Learned counsel adds that the wooden bridge requires frequent and temporary repairs, it poses a grave safety risk to daily commuters, including pedestrians, vehicles, school-going children and traders, endangering lives and impeding daily movement.

[3] Mr. RK Umakanta, learned senior advocate, appearing on behalf of Mr. W. Niranjit, learned State counsel on record for all 3 (three) respondents advertng to the affidavit-in-opposition of the respondents, dated 07.07.2025 and the two annexures thereat viz., Annexures-X/1 and X/2, submits that there is delay in completion of said work by the contractor who has been awarded said work. It is submitted that the contractor who is a Special Class Contractor was awarded said work on 16.08.2019 and date stipulated for completion is 22.08.2021 but there has been delay owing to various circumstances beyond the control of all concerned. Advertng to Annexures-X/1 and X/2, learned State counsel submits that State has taken up the matter with the contractor, the contractor has responded saying that launching of the bridge components particularly steel components is to be executed after the river bridge get dried and water level becomes lower, launching of bridge's components will be done in November/December and the work will be completed by February, 2026. The relevant portion of the affidavit-in-opposition in this regard reads as follows :

'Further, the contractor submitted that "launching of the bridge's steel components has to be executed after the river-beds begin to get dry and the water level becomes lower. Therefore, the launching of the bridges components has to be done during dry season i.e., around November-December. It is hence planned to complete the work within the month of February, 2026 if the situation in the State permits'

To be noted, the deponent of the affidavit-in-opposition is Joint Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur. This Court is informed that RD & PR denotes Rural Development and Panchayati Raj.

[4] Besides the aforesaid paragraph in the affidavit-in-opposition, another paragraph where timeline has been set out is of relevance and the same reads as follows :

'Thereafter, the concerned EE submitted a report vide letter No.35/EE(TBL)/RED/PIL No. 16/2025/145, dated 18-06-2025 highlighting the following key points that:-

i) The construction of Foundation, Sub-structure and Protection works have already been completed earlier on both sides of the river.

ii) 30% of the steel components of the super-structure have already reached the site while remaining 70% are yet to be delivered and are expected to arrive by December, 2025.

iii) It is required to construct "Cofferdam" prior to launching of Steel Components (Super-Structure) which is appropriate during the months of November & December when the water level of river is low. Only then the launching of steel can be completed within January, 2026.

iv) The contractor has been firmly directed to complete the work in all as aspect by February, 2026 and commitment toward this timeline has been affirmed by the Contractor.'

[5] Mr. Ajmal Hussain, learned counsel for PIL petitioner very fairly submits that for the present, it will suffice if the afore-referred stated position of the respondents i.e., State is recorded for giving a closure to the captioned PIL and the captioned MCs thereat.

[6] In the light of the narrative thus far, captioned PIL and the captioned miscellaneous cases thereat (MCs) are given a closure by recording as an undertaking given to this Court, the afore-referred stated position of respondents/State more particularly, an undertaking given by Joint Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur.

[7] It is made clear that it is open to the PIL petitioner or anyone else concerned for the subject matter to come to this court in an appropriate manner if there is breach of the aforesaid timeline. If such an unfortunate scenario unfurls, the same will be considered on its own merits and in accordance with law.

[8] Ergo, the sequitur is, captioned PIL and captioned two MCs thereat are disposed of as closed in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Sushil'


[2] When the matter was taken up, it came to light that the MC application is bereft of particulars which are imperative for considering extension of time prayer and an illustrative list of particulars (not exhaustive) required is as follows :

- i) On 12.01.2025 it was submitted that 30% of steel components for the Super-Structure have already reached the site and remaining 70% will arrive by

December, 2025. How much percentage of steel components has since arrived in the last 6 (six) months?

- ii) The captioned MC is predicated largely on a letter dated 30.03.2026 from the Contractor. If that be so, was there any extension of time given to the Contractor as the said work was awarded on 16.08.2019 and the date stipulated for completion is 22.08.2021?
- iii) What percentage of said work i.e., construction of bridge has been done so far and what remains?
- iv) Other particulars/details which are relevant for considering the extension of time prayer in the captioned MC.

[3] Faced with the above situation, Mr. Wahengbam Niranjit Singh, learned Deputy Government Advocate (State Counsel) on record for the MC applicants (State) sought leave of this Court to withdraw the captioned MC but made a plea to preserve all the rights and contentions of MC applicants (State) to come up with another application with same prayer after giving fuller and better particulars. This request is acceded to and to be noted, the endorsement made by learned State Counsel in this regard in the case file is as follows :



J. W. Niranjit Singh
Dy. G.A. prayed
to withdraw the
Misc application
with liberty.
to Niranjit Singh
27.05.2026

[4] It is made clear that if State comes up with another MC, this disposal shall be disclosed in the MC and instant order shall be enclosed as an Annexure to the MC.

[5] Captioned MC is disposed of as closed/withdrawn albeit with preservation of rights and contentions of MC applicants and liberty as sought for/as set out supra. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

FR/NFR

Sushil

P.S. I : Upload forthwith

P.S. II : All concerned will stand bound by web copy uploaded in High Court website inter alia as the same is QR coded.