

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

MC(REVIEW PET.) No. 20 of 2025

Wangkhem Sunanda Singh, aged about 41 years,
S/o, W. Manao Singh, a resident of Langthabal
Khunou Mayai Leikai, P.O. Wangjing & P.S.
Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur - 795148 & 73
Ors.

... Applicants

- Versus -

Managing Director Manipur Food Industries
Corporation Limited through the Director, Trade
Commerce & Industries, Government of Manipur,
Lamphelpat, P.O. & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West
District, Manipur – 795004 & 6 Ors.

... Respondents

B E F O R E

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. BIMOL SINGH**

For the appellants : Ms. N. Deepika, Advocate
For the respondents : Mr. Leo N., Advocate for R-1
Mr. Nongdamba, Advocate for R-2
Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, Advocate
for R-3 to 7
Date of hearing & order : **31.03.2026**

O R D E R

[M. Sundar, CJ]

[1] Captioned 'miscellaneous case' (MC) has been filed with condonation of delay (CoD) prayer qua 9 (nine) days in filing review petition seeking review of order dated 11.08.2025 made by a Hon'ble Division Bench in MC(WA) No. 204 of 2022 bearing reference WA No. 54 of 2021.

[2] In the captioned MC, Ms. N. Deepika, learned counsel on record for 74 (seventy four) MC applicants, Mr. Leo N., learned counsel for 'respondent No. 1' ('R-1' for the sake of convenience), Mr. Nongdamba, learned counsel for 'respondent No. 2' ('R-2' for the sake of convenience) and Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel for 'respondent Nos. 3 to 7' ('R-3 to 7' for the sake of convenience) are before this Court.

[3] Learned counsel for MC applicants, adverting to MC application more particularly Paragraph No. 5 thereat submits that the delay occurred owing to more time being consumed in consultation between counsel and parties and in drafting the review petition. Learned counsel submits that the delay is neither wanton nor willful but only owing to this bonafide reason. This reason has been set out in Paragraph No. 5 of the MC application.

[4] As regards respondents, learned counsel for R-1, learned counsel for R-2 and learned State counsel for R-3 to 7 submit that if the applicants had been diligent, the said delay could have been avoided.

[5] This Court considered the afore-referred rival submissions.

[6] This Court also considered the facts and circumstances of the case and nature of the matter.

[7] In the light of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of matter, considering how the MC applicants have been circumstanced and also taking into account that there are as many as 74 (seventy four) applicants, this Court finds that the reason for delay i.e. more time being consumed in consultation between counsel and parties and in drafting the review petition is acceptable.

[8] Ergo, sequitur is, delay is condoned.

[9] Registry is directed to process the main review petition and assign a number, if objections are removed and the review petition is otherwise in order.

[10] Post numbering of the review petition, Registry is directed to place the review petition before Chief Justice on administrative side and seek orders regarding assignment and listing as order that is sought to be reviewed (order dated 11.08.2025) which has been made by Hon'ble predecessor Chief Justice and Hon'ble Mr. Justice A. Guneshwar Sharma (Division Bench).

[11] Captioned MC allowed/ordered as prayed for. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Bipin