



2026:MNHC:194

Ningomb
am
Victoria

Digitally signed
by Ningombam
Victoria
Date: 2026.09.03
12:57:28 +05'30'

Item Nos. 1-2

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

CRP(C.R.P. Art.227) No. 43 of 2026

Shri Hitendra Chanambam aged about 52 years S/O late Chanambam Upendra Singh & late Chanambam Ongbi Shanti Devi, a resident of Sagolband Moirang Leirak, PO: & PS: Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur, PIN – 795001.

...Petitioner

- Versus -

Smt. Meenakshi Chanambam aged about 48 years D/O (L) late Ch. Upendra Singh and late Chanambam Ongbi Shanti Devi & W/o Dhiraj Sharma Sanglakpam, a resident of Thangmeiband Lairenhanjabam, PO: & PS: Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur, PIN – 795001.

...Respondent

With

MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227)) No. 68 of 2026

Shri Hitendra Chanambam aged about 52 years S/O late Chanambam Upendra Singh & late Chanambam Ongbi Shanti Devi, a resident of Sagolband Moirang Leirak, PO: & PS: Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur, PIN – 795001.

...Applicant/Petitioner

- Versus -

Smt. Meenakshi Chanambam aged about 48 years D/O (L) late Ch. Upendra Singh and late Chanambam Ongbi Shanti Devi & W/o Dhiraj Sharma Sanglakpam, a resident of Thangmeiband Lairenhanjabam, PO: & PS: Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur, PIN – 795001.

...Opp. Party/Respondent

B E F O R E

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR

For revision petitioner	: Mr. N. Suresh Meetei, Advocate,
For the respondent	: Ms. G. Pushpa, Advocate instructed by Ms. Th. Ranjeeta, Advocate
Date of order	: 02-09-2026

ORDER
(ORAL)

[1] The following abbreviations/short forms have been used in this order (for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity):

Sl. No.	Abbreviation/Short Form/other short references	Full Form/Expansion
1.	CRP	Civil Revision Petition
2.	MC	Miscellaneous Case
3.	said trial court	The Court of Civil Judge (Junior Division), Imphal West-I, Manipur
4.	said revisional authority	Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West District, Manipur
5.	said SDC	Sub-Deputy Collector, Imphal West Central-I.
6.	impugned order	Common order dated 04-06-2026 made by said revisional authority in Revenue Revision Case Nos. 3, 4 & 5 of 2024
7.	said suit	Original Suit No. 4 of 2023 on the file of said trial court

[2] Captioned CRP has been presented in this Court on 24-08-2026 assailing the impugned order.

[3] Mr. N. Suresh, learned counsel on record for revision petitioner is before this Court, to be noted, captioned CRP and captioned MC thereat are in the admission Board.

[4] Short facts shorn of elaboration and details not imperative for appreciating instant order are that one Ch. Upendra Singh who owned three items of immovable properties (one shop site and two homestead lands with superstructure on one of the homestead lands) died on 29-09-2015 leaving behind his wife Shanti Devi, son Hitendra Chanambam (revision petitioner

in captioned CRP) and daughter, Meenakshi Chanambam (lone respondent in captioned CRP) as Class-I legal heirs; that the parties are governed by the Hindu Succession Act, 1956; that post demise of Ch. Upendra Singh, his wife Shanti Devi died on 31-01-2020; that thereafter, Hitendra Ch. claims that he approached the said SDC and obtained mutation orders dated 13-10-2022 in three mutation cases *qua* the three items of immovable properties left behind by his father but this order is neither available with Hitendra Ch. nor is available on the record of said SDC; that daughter, Meenakshi Ch. filed three revision cases being Revision Case Nos. 3, 4 & 5 of 2024 on the file of said revisional authority assailing this 13-10-2022 mutation case orders and the said revisional authority made the impugned order disposing of the revisions *inter alia* on the grounds that absent records of said SDC *qua* mutation cases and mutation case orders there can be no adjudication and making it clear that the parties will stand governed by a civil suit between them i.e., said suit; that to be noted, said suit has been instituted by sole respondent in captioned CRP on 16-01-2023 *qua* the three items of immovable properties of Ch. Upendra Singh *inter alia* with prayers claiming half-share in her father's estate besides declaratory and injunctive reliefs; that in this suit, this Court is informed (by learned counsel for CRP petitioner) that the revision petitioner, Hitendra Ch. has completed pleadings by filing a written statement making a counter-claim predicated on Hindu oral family arrangement; that said suit is now next scheduled to be listed in the said trial court on 15-09-2026.

[5] Mr. N. Suresh, learned counsel on record, submits that said revenue revisional authority should have adjudicated the revision cases

even in the absence of documents/records of said SDC *qua* mutation orders dated 13-10-2022.

[6] Issue notice.

[7] Ms. G. Pushpa, learned counsel who is present in Court, accepts notice for the lone respondent and submits that she is ready to argue the main CRP without insisting on filing an affidavit-in-opposition in captioned MC.

[8] Mr. N. Suresh, learned counsel on record for revision petitioner, also agrees to have the main CRP taken up and heard out.

[9] Therefore, with the consent of learned counsel on both sides, main CRP was taken up and heard out.

[10] In response to afore-referred contention of learned counsel for revision petitioner, learned counsel for respondent submitted that there can be no adjudication absent records and the plea of purported Hindu family arrangement is totally denied. To be noted, written statement with counter-claim is not before this Court and therefore, the submission of learned counsel for revision petitioner that counter-claim is predicated on an oral family arrangement is only a record of submission made by learned counsel in this Court.

[11] This Court carefully considered the rival contentions. The scope of captioned CRP is acutely narrow and the perimeter within which captioned CRP has to perambulate is very limited. Captioned CRP also comes across as a classic exception to the age-old adage '*blood is thicker than water*' as it is a case of intense contest between siblings for immovable properties/ estate of their late father. To be noted, respondent contends that the revision

petitioner is collecting the entire rental income for estate of father without even sharing it with her and when she approached the revision petitioner on 18-12-2021 with a request to share the rental income it was negatived.

[12] In the light of limited scope of captioned CRP and acutely narrow compass on which the captioned matter turns, this Court makes it clear that it would express no opinion on merits of rival contentions *inter alia* owing to pendency of said suit in said trial court. One more reason for taking this course is, both learned counsel fairly agree that they will stand governed by the outcome/verdict in said suit in said trial court subject of course to rights of appeal which may be available to the parties.

[13] It is made clear that the impugned order is not sustained on merits and it is not dislodged either. The impugned order would neither impede nor impel the contentions of both sides. However, after the said trial court returns a verdict in the said civil suit, it is open to the parties to seek mutation afresh based on the verdict of Civil Court untrammelled by impugned order which is neither sustained on merits nor dislodged.

[14] In the light of the narrative, discussion and dispositive reasoning thus far, owing to consensus between the two learned counsel about which there is allusion elsewhere *supra* in this order, captioned CRP is given a closure by writing that captioned CRP is disposed of as closed preserving the rights and contentions of both sides to pursue the same in legal drill i.e., to ensue in said suit in said trial court. Consequently, captioned MC thereat has become otiose and the same is also disposed of as closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Victoria