

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

MC (W.A.) No. 105 of 2025

1. State of Manipur, represented by the Addl. Chief Secretary (Works), Government of Manipur, Old Secretariat Complex, Babupara, Imphal – 795001.
2. The Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Government of Manipur, Khuyathong, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

Applicants

Vs.

1. RK Purnachandra Singh aged about 65 years, S/o RK Modhusana Singh of Patsoi Part III, Imphal West District, Manipur.
2. The Accountant General (A & E), Babupara, Imphal – 795001, Manipur.

Respondents

For applicants : Mr. W. Niranjit, Deputy Government Advocate

For respondents : Ms. L. Sillori, Advocate for respondent No. 1

Mr. S. Jasobanta, Advocate for respondent No. 2

Date of order : 13.03.2026

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA
(ORDER)

M. Sundar, CJ

[1] Captioned 'Miscellaneous Case' ('MC' for the sake of brevity) has been filed with a Condonation of Delay (CoD) prayer *qua* 141 days delay in filing an intra court State appeal.

[2] Mr. W. Niranjit, learned State counsel for MC applicants, Ms. L. Sillori, learned counsel for respondent No. 1 and Mr. S. Jasobanta, learned counsel for respondent No. 2 are before this Court.

[3] Captioned CoD MC was taken up and heard out with the consent of all the afore-referred learned counsel.

[4] Mr. W. Niranjit, learned State counsel for MC applicants, advertent to paragraph 3 of the MC application, more particularly, the tabulation thereat, submitted that filing of the intra court appeal had to go through several tiers in the Government and certain difficulties in certain tiers has caused the delay. Learned State counsel went on to submit that the delay is neither willful nor wanton but only owing to bonafide reasons, the details of which have been set out in the form of adumbration/tabulation *vide* paragraph 3 in the MC application. This Court perused the same.

[5] As regards respondents, both learned counsel for respondents, submit that State should have been more diligent and the delays are clearly avoidable.

[6] This Court carefully considered the competing submissions. Though some aspects of the delay are avoidable, the entire matter when viewed in its totality, leaves us with the opinion that the delay is neither willful nor wanton. Be that as it may, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the matter, the issues involved and more particularly, the manner in which the parties have been circumstanced, this Court is of the considered view that this is a fit case for condoning the delay. CoD prayer is acceded to, the delay is condoned.

[7] Registry to process the appeal, if objections are removed and assign a number and list the matter, if otherwise in order.

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

Sandeep

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE