

Oinam
Thoiba Meitei

Item no. 63 & 64

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

Digitally signed by
Oinam Thoiba Meitei
Date: 2026.08.12
10:30:50 +05'30'

**Cont. Cas(C) No. 21 of 2026 with
MC (Review Pet.) No. 12 of 2026**

Maharabam Pheijao Singh

.... *Petitioner*

- *Versus* -

V.K. Dewangan and Anr.

.... *Respondents*

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

ORDER

11.08.2026

[1] Present Mr. A. Romenkumar, learned sr. counsel assisted by Mr. RK Banna, learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner in Cont. Cas(C) No. 21 of 2026 and Mrs. Ch. Sundari, learned GA on behalf of State applicants in MC(Review. Pet.) No. 12 of 2026.

[2] Contempt petition has been filed by the writ petitioner in WP(C) No. 717 of 2024 for non-compliance of the direction of this Court in order dated 07.11.2025 whereby, the State respondents were directed to release the pensionary benefits to the petitioner, if the same is entitled in terms of the law and rejected the contentions of the State respondents withholding the pensionary benefits within the pendency of the FIR No. 348(12) IPS u/s 409/420/34 IPC & 13(1)(c)13(2) of PC Act. However, while disposing this Court clarified that no opinion has been expressed regarding merit of the pending criminal case against the petitioner herein. Since the direction has not been complied, the petitioner approaches this Court by way of present contempt case being Cont. Cas(C) No. 21 of 2026. The respondents filed counter affidavit by stating that the enquiry is still pending, however, the stand taken in the counter affidavit is not sustainable in view of the direction of this Court in 'para 10' of the impugned order dated 07.11.2025. During the pendency of the present contempt petition, State filed an application being MC (Review. Pet.) No. 12 of 2026 for

condonation of 240 days in filing review petition against the order dated 07.11.2025 in WP(C) No. 717 of 2024. Even though, the review petition is not number on perusal of the petition and the only reason for coming of review before this Court is apprehension after the pensionary benefits is released as directed by this Court in absence of any observations regarding recovery of the amount paid in case of conviction of the criminal case. The State respondents may not be able to recover the amount so paid.

[3] This Court is of the view that without expressing so also, if the petitioner is later on convicted in a criminal case, the provision of law especially, 'Rule 9' of the CCS (Pension) Rules will be applicable. In the circumstance, without going to the merit of the review petition, the apprehension of the State is misplaced.

[4] During the course of hearing, Mrs. Ch. Sundari, learned GA submits that State is in active compliance of the direction of this Court in order dated 07.11.2025 and may be given some more time.

[5] 1(one) month time is given to the State respondents for compliance of the direction in 'para 10' of the order dated 07.11.2025 and it is mentioned that recovery, if any, may be made under the applicable rules. In the circumstances, MC (Review. Pet.) No. 12 of 2026 is closed as infructuous in terms of the observations made above.

[6] List the Cont. Cas(C) No. 21 of 2026 on 11.09.2026 for submission of compliance report.

JUDGE

Thoiba