

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

MC (WA) No. 116 of 2025

[Ref: WA No. 67 of 2019]

Shri Gaisuilung Gonmei aged about 65 years, S/o Gaichanglung
Gonmei a resident of Makhua village, P.O. & P.S. Noney,
Noney District, Manipur, Pin - 795159.

Applicant

Vs.

- 1.** The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner (Revenue), Government of Manipur, P.O – Imphal, P.S. – Imphal West, Manipur - 795001.
- 2.** The Deputy Commissioner, Tamenglong, Tamenglong District, Manipur - 795141.
- 3.** The Deputy Commissioner, Noney, Noney District, Manipur - 795159.
- 4.** The Deputy Chief Engineer, CON/NF-Railway, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur - 795140.

Respondents

BEFORE

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

For applicants	Mr. Th. Ibohal, Senior Advocate, instructed by Mr. Nishal Likmabam, Advocate
For respondent Nos. 1-3	Mr. RK. Umakanta, Senior Advocate, instructed by Mr. W. Niranjit, Dy. Government Advocate
For respondent No. 4	Mr. BR Sharma, Central Government Counsel (CGC) along with Ms. Pamchui, Advocate
Date of Order	09.09.2026

ORDER

(M. Sundar, CJ)

[1] Captioned 'Miscellaneous Case' ('MC' for the sake of brevity) has been taken out by the sole appellant in the captioned 'Writ Appeal' ('WA' for the sake of brevity) with a simple prayer to bring on record a reply obtained

by the MC applicant by making a query under 'Right to Information Act, 2005 (22 of 2005)' {'RTI Act' for the sake of brevity}.

[2] The MC applicant is the querist under RTI Act and the reply is a 'communication dated 20.08.2025 bearing reference No. **File No.: DC(TML)12/R.T.I./2025** from Deputy Commissioner, Tamenglong' ('said RTI response' for the sake of convenience) and a scanned reproduction of said RTI response is as follows:

- 9 -

ANNEXURE - X/4
18/08/2025

GOVERNMENT OF MANIPUR
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, TAMENGLONG

File No.: DC(TML)12/R.T.I./2025; Tamenglong, the 20th August, 2025

To
Shri Galsuitung Gonmel,
S/o Late Galchanglung Gonmel,
Makhuam Village, P.O. & P.S. - Noney,
Noney District, Manipur - 795159.

Subject: Furnishing of Information under RTI Act, 2005 - In compliance with
Appeal Case No. 109 of 2025.

Sir,

With reference to your RTI application dated 07.04.2025 and subsequent appeals under the RTI Act, 2005, I am to furnish the following information after due verification and reconciliation of relevant records:

5. Details for the Information sought-

(i) Status of Award Amount:

The award amount of ₹16,51,566/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Fifty-One Thousand Five Hundred and Fifty-Six only) sanctioned in your name under Ref. No. DC(TML) 11/370 (RLV) MAKH/2011 for the Jiribam-Tupul Railway Project is confirmed to be unpaid, and moreover, is not lying in the account of the office of the District Collector, Tamenglong.

(ii) The said amount has not been withdrawn by any individual. The disbursement could not be made earlier due to non-requisition of adequate funds from NF Railways by the then administration. The office of the Deputy Commissioner, Tamenglong, had no available balance under the award account to effect payment.

The matter has now been reconciled, and steps are being actively taken to liaise with NF Railways for release of requisite funds, so that your entitled compensation may be settled at the earliest.

This reply is being furnished under Section 7 and 19 of the RTI Act, 2005, during the pendency of the appeal before the Manipur Information Commission, to ensure compliance and transparency.

We regret the inconvenience caused due to procedural delays and assure you of our full cooperation in this matter.

Yours sincerely,
Digitally signed by
I. Anshim Dargachava Maring
(Dr. L. Anshim Dargachava Maring)
Deputy Commissioner, Tamenglong

TRUE COPY
Karlumond Kh
Advocate.

Comm. of Affidavit
High Court of Manipur
Imphal (Manipur)

[3] Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 have not filed affidavits-in-opposition and as regards respondent No. 4, an affidavit-in-opposition dated 07.09.2026 has been filed.

[4] Be that as it may, considering the innocuous nature of the prayer, Mr. RK Umakanta, senior counsel and learned public prosecutor,, instructed by Mr. W. Niranjit, learned State counsel for respondent Nos. 1 to 3, on instructions and Mr. BR Sharma, learned CGC for respondent No. 4 (notwithstanding the affidavit-in-opposition) submitted that they are not opposing the prayer to bring on record said RTI response but they only request that their rights and contentions to make submissions on merits *qua* said RTI response and the contents of the same may be preserved.

[5] The afore-referred fair stand of learned State counsel for respondent Nos. 1 to 3 and learned CGC for respondent No. 4 (notwithstanding the affidavit-in-opposition) makes the task of disposal of captioned MC fairly simple. This means that this Court need not be detained further by captioned MC.

[6] Captioned MC is allowed/ordered as prayed for albeit with preservation of rights and contentions of the respondents as above. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

Sandeep

CHIEF JUSTICE