

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

**REVIEW PETITION No. 33 of 2025**

[Ref.: W.A. No. 9 of 2024]

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

*... Review Petitioners*

*- Versus -*

1. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.

2. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
3. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
4. Shri Lourembam Rameshwar Singh, aged about 61 years old, S/o. Lourembam Gulamjat Singh, a resident of Moirangkampu Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
5. Shri Leimram Rajen Singh, aged about 64 years old, S/o. Leimram Iboton Singh, a resident of Khurai Konsam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
6. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
7. Smt. Aheibam Sunanta Devi @ Ngairangbam Sunanta Devi, aged about 50 years old, W/o. Aheibam Sharat Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrikhong Mayai Leikai, Langthabal, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.
8. Shri Laishram Menjor Singh, aged about 53 years old, S/o. L. Rajmohon Singh, resident of Nachou Awang Leikai, Ward No. 2, P.O. P.S. & District, Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.
9. Smt. L. Kananbala Devi, aged about 55 years, W/o, L. Subashchandra Singh, resident of Khurai Chingangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
10. Shri Shanamatum Singh, aged about 43 years, S/o. Kh. Ibo Singh, resident of Ngaikhong Khullen Maning Leikai, P.O. P.S. & District Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.

*... Respondents*

11. Shri Mutum Boren Singh, aged about 52 years, resident of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, Imphal, P.O. Imphal HO, District – Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
12. Shri Konjengbam Jayenta Singh aged about 50 years S/o Konjengbam Laimani Singh of Kwakeithel Konjeng Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
13. Shri Chongtham Ranjan Singh, aged about 40 years, S/o Chongtham Budhichandra Singh of Heirangoithong Naoriya Pakhanglakpa Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
14. Shri Laishram Johnson Singh, aged about 34 years, S/o. L. Somorendro Singh, Malom Tuliyaime Awang Leikai, Malom Tuliyaime, P.O. Tuliha, District - Imphal West, Manipur – 795140.
15. Shri Thoudam Apollo Mangang, aged about 34 years, S/o Thoudam Angousana Manang of Kodompokpi Mamang Leikai, Kodompokpi, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
16. Shri Loitongbam Herojit Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o Loitongbam Amuba Singh of Hiyangthang Mayai Leikai, Hiyangthang, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
17. Shri Sapam Jiten Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Sapam Jugeshwor Singh of Langthabal Lep Awang Leikai, Canchipur, Manipur University, Imphal West, Manipur – 795003.

.... *Proforma Respondents*

### **REVIEW PETITION NO. 34 OF 2025**

[Ref.: W.A. No. 10 of 2024]

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

*... Review Petitioners*

*- Versus -*

1. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
2. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
3. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
4. Smt. Khangembam Manishang Devi aged about 51 years old, W/o Khangembam Priyojit Singh, a resident of Tentha Khongbal Mayai Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
5. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam

- Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
6. Mrs. Wahida Banu aged about 47 years old, W/o Kamarudin, a resident of Yairipok Changamdabi Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.
  7. Md. Fazlur Rahman aged about 49 years old, S/o. Md. Babu Khan, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
  8. Mrs. Muktiyar aged about 52 years old, W/o Md. Basiruddin, a resident of Urup Khunnou Makha Leikai, P.O. Lilong & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur 795130.
  9. Shri Kangabam Chourajit Singh aged about 50 years old, S/o Kangabam Noyon Singh of Langdum Maning Leikai, P.O. Singjamei & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795008.
  10. Md. Saphauddin aged about 32 years old, S/o. Md. Ziaoddin of Kiyamgei Awang Leikai, Kiyangmei Muslim, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795003.
  11. Abdul Khaliq aged about 58 years old, S/o Abdur Rahaman, a resident of Yairipok Tuliha Toupokpi Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.
  12. The Manipur State Election Commission represented by Secretary, the Manipur State Election Commission, Office at Lamphelpat, P.O. & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795004.

.... Respondents

### **REVIEW PETITION NO. 35 OF 2025**

[Ref.: W.A. No. 11 of 2024]

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.

2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, SIRD Complex, Porompat, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.

*.... Review Petitioners*

- Versus -

1. Md. Fazlur Rahman aged about 49 years old, S/o. Md. Babu Khan, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
2. Md. Najimuddin aged about 41 years old, S/o. Mazid, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Makha Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
3. Mrs. Ibemma aged about 41 years old, W/o. Md. Khalil Shah, a resident of Kshetri Awang Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
4. Md. Qutub Ali, aged about 49 years old, S/o. Muhammad Ahamed Ali, a resident of Kshetri Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
5. Mrs. Taslima Begum, aged about 43 years old, W/o. Md. Ziyauddin Khan, a resident of Kshetri Makha Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. Wajida Benu aged about 47 years old, W/o. Kamarudin, a resident of Yairipok Changamdabi Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.

*.... Respondents*

**REVIEW PETITION NO. 37 OF 2025**

[Ref.: W.A. No. 11 of 2024]

1. Laishram Nabakumar Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o (L) Laishram Yaima Singh, a resident of Luker Maning Leikai, P.O. Langjing & P.S. Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795113.
2. Arambam Sundarlal Singh, aged about 54, S/o. (L) A. Mangi Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrimakhong Awang Leikai, P.O. Singjamei, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.
3. Laishram Bobby Devi, aged about 46 years, C/o (L) Laishram Ibochaoba Singh, a resident of Khongampat Awang Leikai, P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Sekmai, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795002.
4. Moirangthem Rajmani Singh, aged about 49 years, S/o Moirangthem Tombi Singh, a resident of Heirok Part – I, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Heirok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
5. Khudrakpam Sobha Singh, aged about 47 years, S/o Khudrakpam Pishak Singh, a resident of Yairipok Malom, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795149.
6. Salam Kumar Meitei, aged about 58 years, S/o Salam Tombi Meitei, a resident of Yairipok Khoirom Mathak Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795149.
7. Oinam Sharatchandra Singh, aged about 52 years, S/o Oinam Rupachandra Singh, a resident of Heirangoithong Maibam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795008.
8. Waikhom Chandrakumar Meitei, aged about 46 years, S/o W. Machaton Meitei, a resident of Khongampat Khunou P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Sekmai Imphal West District, Manipur – 795002.
9. Thongam Indrajit Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o Th (L) Gouro Singh, a resident of Singjamei Khongnang Pheidekpi, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795008.

10. Naorem Brucelee Meitei, aged about 49 years, S/o (L) N. Ibomcha Meitei, a resident of Singjamei Makha Naorem Leikai, P.O. Canchipur P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur -795003.

.... *Petitioners*

- Versus -

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East SIRD Complex, Porompat, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.

....*Respondents*

4. Md. Fazlur Rahman, aged about 49 years old, S/o Md. Babu Khan, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
5. Md. Najimuddin, aged about 41 years, S/o. Mazid, a resident of Kshetri Bengoonmakha Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O.& P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. Mrs. Ibemma, aged about 41 years, W/o Md. Khalil Shah, a resident of Kshetri Awang Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
7. Md. Qutub Ali, aged about 49 years, S/o Muhammad Ahamed Ali, a resident of Kshetri Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
8. Mrs. Taslima Begum aged about 43 years, W/o Md. Ziyauddin Khan, a resident of Kshetri Makha Leikai,

Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.

9. Wajida Benu, aged about 47 years, W/o Kamarudin, a resident of Yairipok Changamdabi Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District Manipur – 795149.

....*Proforma Respondents*

### **REVIEW PETITION NO. 38 OF 2025**

[Ref.: W.A. No. 9 of 2024]

1. Laishram Nabakumar Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o (L) Laishram Yaima Singh, a resident of Luker Maning Leikai, P.O. Langjing & P.S. Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795113.
2. Arambam Sundarlal Singh, aged about 54, S/o. (L) A. Mangi Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrimakhong Awang Leikai, P.O. Singjamei, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.
3. Laishram Bobby Devi, aged about 46 years, C/o (L) Laishram Ibochaoba Singh, a resident of Khongampat Awang Leikai, P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Sekmai, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795002.
4. Moirangthem Rajmani Singh, aged about 49 years, S/o Moirangthem Tombi Singh, a resident of Heirok Part – I, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Heirok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
5. Khudrakpam Sobha Singh, aged about 47 years, S/o Khudrakpam Pishak Singh, a resident of Yairipok Malom, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795149.
6. Salam Kumar Meitei, aged about 58 years, S/o Salam Tombi Meitei, a resident of Yairipok Khoirom Mathak Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795149.
7. Oinam Sharatchandra Singh, aged about 52 years, S/o Oinam Rupachandra Singh, a resident of Heirangoithong Maibam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795008.
8. Waikhom Chandrakumar Meitei, aged about 46 years, S/o W. Machaton Meitei, a resident of Khongampat

Khunou P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Sekmai Imphal West District, Manipur – 795002.

9. Thongam Indrajit Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o Th (L) Gouro Singh, a resident of Singjamei Khongnang Pheidekpi, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795008.
10. Naorem Brucelee Meitei, aged about 49 years, S/o (L) N. Ibomcha Meitei, a resident of Singjamei Makha Naorem Leikai, P.O. Canchipur P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur -795003.

.... *Petitioners*

- Versus -

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

.... *Respondents*

9. Shri Mutum Boren Singh, aged about 52 years, resident of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, Imphal, P.O. Imphal HO, District – Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
10. Shri Konjengbam Jayenta Singh aged about 50 years S/o Konjengbam Laimani Singh of Kwakeithel Konjeng Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
11. Shri Chongtham Ranjan Singh, aged about 40 years, S/o Chongtham Budhichandra Singh of Heirangoithong Naoriya Pakhanglakpa Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
12. Shri Laishram Johnson Singh, aged about 34 years, S/o. L. Somorendro Singh, Malom Tuliyaime Awang Leikai, Malom Tuliyaime, P.O. Tuliha, District - Imphal West, Manipur – 795140.
13. Shri Thoudam Apollo Mangang, aged about 34 years, S/o Thoudam Angousana Manang of Kodompokpi Mamang Leikai, Kodompokpi, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
14. Shri Loitongbam Herojit Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o Loitongbam Amuba Singh of Hiyangthang Mayai Leikai, Hiyangthang, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
15. Shri Sapam Jiten Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Sapam Jugeshwar Singh of Langthabal Lep Awang Leikai, Canchipur, Manipur University, Imphal West, Manipur – 795003.
16. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
17. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
18. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
19. Shri Lourembam Rameshwar Singh, aged about 61 years old, S/o. Lourembam Gulamjat Singh, a resident

- of Moirangkampu Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
20. Shri Leimram Rajen Singh, aged about 64 years old, S/o. Leimram Iboton Singh, a resident of Khurai Konsam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
  21. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
  22. Smt. Aheibam Sunanta Devi @ Ngairangbam Sunanta Devi, aged about 50 years old, W/o. Aheibam Sharat Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrikhong Mayai Leikai, Langthabal, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.
  23. Shri Laishram Menjor Singh, aged about 53 years old, S/o. L. Rajmohon Singh, resident of Nachou Awang Leikai, Ward No. 2, P.O. P.S. & District, Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.
  24. Smt. L. Kananbala Devi, aged about 55 years, W/o, L. Subashchandra Singh, resident of Khurai Chingangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
  25. Shri Shanamatum Singh, aged about 43 years, S/o. Kh. Ibo Singh, resident of Ngaikhong Khullen Maning Leikai, P.O. P.S. & District Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.

.... *Proforma Respondents*

### **REVIEW PETITION NO. 39 OF 2025**

[Ref.: W.A. No. 10 of 2024]

1. Laishram Nabakumar Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o (L) Laishram Yaima Singh, a resident of Luker Maning Leikai, P.O. Langjing & P.S. Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795113.
2. Arambam Sundarlal Singh, aged about 54, S/o. (L) A. Mangi Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrimakhong Awang Leikai, P.O. Singjamei, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.

3. Laishram Bobby Devi, aged about 46 years, C/o (L) Laishram Ibochaoba Singh, a resident of Khongampat Awang Leikai, P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Sekmai, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795002.
4. Moirangthem Rajmani Singh, aged about 49 years, S/o Moirangthem Tombi Singh, a resident of Heirok Part – I, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Heirok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
5. Khudrakpam Sobha Singh, aged about 47 years, S/o Khudrakpam Pishak Singh, a resident of Yairipok Malom, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795149.
6. Salam Kumar Meitei, aged about 58 years, S/o Salam Tombi Meitei, a resident of Yairipok Khoirom Mathak Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795149.
7. Oinam Sharatchandra Singh, aged about 52 years, S/o Oinam Rupachandra Singh, a resident of Heirangoithong Maibam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795008.
8. Waikhom Chandrakumar Meitei, aged about 46 years, S/o W. Machaton Meitei, a resident of Khongampat Khunou P.O. Mantripukhri & P.S. Sekmai Imphal West District, Manipur – 795002.
9. Thongam Indrajit Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o Th (L) Gouro Singh, a resident of Singjamei Khongnang Pheidekpi, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795008.
10. Naorem Brucelee Meitei, aged about 49 years, S/o (L) N. Ibomcha Meitei, a resident of Singjamei Makha Naorem Leikai, P.O. Canchipur P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur -795003.

*.... Petitioners*

- Versus -

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.

2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.
9. The Manipur State Election Commission represented by Secretary, the Manipur State Election Commission, Office at Lamphelpat, P.O. & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795004.
10. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
11. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
12. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
13. Smt. Khangembam Manishang Devi aged about 51 years old, W/o Khangembam Priyokit Singh, a resident of

- Tentha Khongbal Mayai Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
14. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
  15. Mrs. Wahida Banu aged about 47 years old, W/o Kamarudin, a resident of Yairipok Changamdabi Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.
  16. Md. Fazlur Rahman aged about 49 years old, S/o. Md. Babu Khan, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
  17. Mrs. Muktiyar aged about 52 years old, W/o Md. Basiruddin, a resident of Urup Khunnou Makha Leikai, P.O. Lilong & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur 795130.
  18. Shri Kangabam Chourajit Singh aged about 50 years old, S/o Kangabam Noyon Singh of Langdum Maning Leikai, P.O. Singjamei & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795008.
  19. Md. Saphauddin aged about 32 years old, S/o. Md. Ziaoddin of Kiyamgei Awang Leikai, Kiyamgei Muslim, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795003.
  20. Abdul Khalique aged about 58 years old, S/o Abdur Rahaman, a resident of Yairipok Tuliha Toupokpi Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.

....*Proforma Respondents*

**MC(REV. PET.) NO. 27 OF 2025**

(Ref. : Review Petition No. 33 of 2025)

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.

2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

*.... Applicants*

- Versus -

1. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
2. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
3. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
4. Shri Lourembam Rameshwar Singh, aged about 61 years old, S/o. Lourembam Gulamjat Singh, a resident of Moirangkampu Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.

5. Shri Leimram Rajen Singh, aged about 64 years old, S/o. Leimram Iboton Singh, a resident of Khurai Konsam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
6. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
7. Smt. Aheibam Sunanta Devi @ Ngairangbam Sunanta Devi, aged about 50 years old, W/o. Aheibam Sharat Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrikhong Mayai Leikai, Langthabal, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.
8. Shri Laishram Menjor Singh, aged about 53 years old, S/o. L. Rajmohon Singh, resident of Nachou Awang Leikai, Ward No. 2, P.O. P.S. & District, Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.
9. Smt. L. Kananbala Devi, aged about 55 years, W/o, L. Subashchandra Singh, resident of Khurai Chingangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
10. Shri Shanamatum Singh, aged about 43 years, S/o. Kh. Ibo Singh, resident of Ngaikhong Khullen Maning Leikai, P.O. P.S. & District Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.

*.... Respondents*

11. Shri Mutum Boren Singh, aged about 52 years, resident of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, Imphal, P.O. Imphal HO, District – Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
12. Shri Konjengbam Jayenta Singh aged about 50 years S/o Konjengbam Laimani Singh of Kwakeithel Konjeng Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
13. Shri Chongtham Ranjan Singh, aged about 40 years, S/o Chongtham Budhichandra Singh of Heirangoithong Naoriya Pakhanglakpa Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
14. Shri Laishram Johnson Singh, aged about 34 years, S/o. L. Somorendro Singh, Malom Tuliyaime Awang Leikai,

- Malom Tuliyaime, P.O. Tuliha, District - Imphal West, Manipur – 795140.
15. Shri Thoudam Apollo Mangang, aged about 34 years, S/o Thoudam Angousana Manang of Kodompokpi Mamang Leikai, Kodompokpi, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
  16. Shri Loitongbam Herojit Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o Loitongbam Amuba Singh of Hiyangthang Mayai Leikai, Hiyangthang, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
  17. Shri Sapam Jiten Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Sapam Jugeshwor Singh of Langthabal Lep Awang Leikai, Canchipur, Manipur University, Imphal West, Manipur – 795003.

.... *Proforma Respondents*

**MC(REV. PET.) NO. 28 OF 2025**

(Ref. : Review Petition No. 34 of 2025)

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.

7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

*.... Applicants*

- Versus -

1. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
2. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
3. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
4. Smt. Khangembam Manishang Devi aged about 51 years old, W/o Khangembam Priyokit Singh, a resident of Tentha Khongbal Mayai Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
5. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
6. Mrs. Wahida Banu aged about 47 years old, W/o Kamarudin, a resident of Yairipok Changamdabi Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.
7. Md. Fazlur Rahman aged about 49 years old, S/o. Md. Babu Khan, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.

8. Mrs. Muktiyar aged about 52 years old, W/o Md. Basiruddin, a resident of Urup Khunnou Makha Leikai, P.O. Lilong & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur 795130.
9. Shri Kangabam Chourajit Singh aged about 50 years old, S/o Kangabam Noyon Singh of Langdum Maning Leikai, P.O. Singjamei & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795008.
10. Md. Saphauddin aged about 32 years old, S/o. Md. Ziaoddin of Kiyamgei Awang Leikai, Kiyangmei Muslim, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795003.
11. Abdul Khalique aged about 58 years old, S/o Abdur Rahaman, a resident of Yairipok Tuliha Toupokpi Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.
12. The Manipur State Election Commission represented by Secretary, the Manipur State Election Commission, Office at Lamphelpat, P.O. & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795004.

*.... Respondents*

### **MC(REV. PET.) NO. 29 OF 2025**

(Ref. : Review Petition No. 35 of 2025)

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.

*.... Applicants*

- Versus -

1. Md. Fazlur Rahman aged about 49 years old, S/o. Md. Babu Khan, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
2. Md. Najimuddin aged about 41 years old, S/o. Mazid, a resident of Kshetri Bengoon Makha Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
3. Mrs. Ibemma aged about 41 years old, W/o. Md. Khalil Shah, a resident of Kshetri Awang Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
4. Md. Qutub Ali, aged about 49 years old, S/o. Muhammad Ahamed Ali, a resident of Kshetri Mayai Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
5. Mrs. Taslima Begum, aged about 43 years old, W/o. Md. Ziyauddin Khan, a resident of Kshetri Makha Leikai, Kshetrigao, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. Wajida Benu aged about 47 years old, W/o. Kamarudin, a resident of Yairipok Changamdabi Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795149.

.... Respondents

**MC(REV. PET.) NO. 2 OF 2026**

(Ref. : Review Petition No. 33 of 2025)

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.

4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

*.... Applicants*

- Versus -

1. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
2. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
3. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
4. Shri Lourembam Rameshwar Singh, aged about 61 years old, S/o. Lourembam Gulamjat Singh, a resident of Moirangkampu Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
5. Shri Leimram Rajen Singh, aged about 64 years old, S/o. Leimram Iboton Singh, a resident of Khurai Konsam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.

6. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
7. Smt. Aheibam Sunanta Devi @ Ngairangbam Sunanta Devi, aged about 50 years old, W/o. Aheibam Sharat Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrikhong Mayai Leikai, Langthabal, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.
8. Shri Laishram Menjor Singh, aged about 53 years old, S/o. L. Rajmohon Singh, resident of Nachou Awang Leikai, Ward No. 2, P.O. P.S. & District, Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.
9. Smt. L. Kananbala Devi, aged about 55 years, W/o, L. Subashchandra Singh, resident of Khurai Chingangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
10. Shri Shanamatum Singh, aged about 43 years, S/o. Kh. Ibo Singh, resident of Ngaikhong Khullen Maning Leikai, P.O. P.S. & District Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.

*.... Respondents*

11. Shri Mutum Boren Singh, aged about 52 years, resident of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, Imphal, P.O. Imphal HO, District – Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
12. Shri Konjengbam Jayenta Singh aged about 50 years S/o Konjengbam Laimani Singh of Kwakeithel Konjeng Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
13. Shri Chongtham Ranjan Singh, aged about 40 years, S/o Chongtham Budhichandra Singh of Heirangoithong Naoriya Pakhanglakpa Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
14. Shri Laishram Johnson Singh, aged about 34 years, S/o. L. Somorendro Singh, Malom Tuliayima Awang Leikai, Malom Tuliayima, P.O. Tuliha, District - Imphal West, Manipur – 795140.
15. Shri Thoudam Apollo Mangang, aged about 34 years, S/o Thoudam Angousana Manang of Kodompokpi Mamang Leikai, Kodompokpi, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.

16. Shri Loitongbam Herojit Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o Loitongbam Amuba Singh of Hiyangthang Mayai Leikai, Hiyangthang, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
17. Shri Sapam Jiten Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Sapam Jugeshwor Singh of Langthabal Lep Awang Leikai, Canchipur, Manipur University, Imphal West, Manipur – 795003.

*.... Proforma Respondents*

**MC(REV. PET.) NO. 3 OF 2026**

(Ref. : Review Petition No. 33 of 2025)

1. Shri Pheiroijam Heramani, aged about 50 years old, S/o. Ph. Biramani, a resident of Charangpat Mamang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
2. Shri Sorokhaibam Imo Singh, aged about 55 years old, S/o. Sorokhaibam Budhi Singh, a resident of Charangpat Mayai Leikai, Charangpat Mamang, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
3. Shri Naorem Pradeep Singh aged about 40 years old, S/o. Naorem Inaobi Singh, a resident of Tentha Khunjao Naorem Leikai, Tentha, P.O. Wangjing & P.S. Khongjom, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795148.
4. Shri Ngangom John Meetei, aged about 52 years old, S/o. Ng. Lalmani Singh, a resident of Khurai Thongam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.

*.... Applicants*

- Versus -

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (RD & PR), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat, North Block, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Director (RD & PR), Manipur, having its office at Old Secretariat, South Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

3. The Deputy Commissioner, Thoubal, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795138.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bishnupur, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur – 795126.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal East, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
6. The Deputy Commissioner, Imphal West, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
7. The Deputy Commissioner, Jiribam, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur – 795116.
8. The Deputy Commissioner, Kakching, Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

*.... Respondents*

9. Shri Lourembam Rameshwar Singh, aged about 61 years old, S/o. Lourembam Gulamjat Singh, a resident of Moirangkampu Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
10. Shri Leimram Rajen Singh, aged about 64 years old, S/o. Leimram Iboton Singh, a resident of Khurai Konsam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795010.
11. Smt. Aheibam Sunanta Devi @ Ngairangbam Sunanta Devi, aged about 50 years old, W/o. Aheibam Sharat Singh, a resident of Langthabal Mantrikhong Mayai Leikai, Langthabal, P.O. Canchipur & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795003.
8. Shri Laishram Menjor Singh, aged about 53 years old, S/o. L. Rajmohon Singh, resident of Nachou Awang Leikai, Ward No. 2, P.O. P.S. & District, Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.
9. Smt. L. Kananbala Devi, aged about 55 years, W/o, L. Subashchandra Singh, resident of Khurai Chingangbam

- Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795005.
10. Shri Shanamatum Singh, aged about 43 years, S/o. Kh. Ibo Singh, resident of Ngaikhong Khullen Maning Leikai, P.O. P.S. & District Bishnupur, Manipur – 795126.
  11. Shri Mutum Boren Singh, aged about 52 years, resident of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, Imphal, P.O. Imphal HO, District – Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
  12. Shri Konjengbam Jayenta Singh aged about 50 years S/o Konjengbam Laimani Singh of Kwakeithel Konjeng Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
  13. Shri Chongtham Ranjan Singh, aged about 40 years, S/o Chongtham Budhichandra Singh of Heirangoithong Naoriya Pakhanglakpa Leikai, Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.
  14. Shri Laishram Johnson Singh, aged about 34 years, S/o. L. Somorendro Singh, Malom Tuliyaime Awang Leikai, Malom Tuliyaime, P.O. Tuliha, District - Imphal West, Manipur – 795140.
  15. Shri Thoudam Apollo Mangang, aged about 34 years, S/o Thoudam Angousana Manang of Kodompokpi Mamang Leikai, Kodompokpi, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
  16. Shri Loitongbam Herojit Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o Loitongbam Amuba Singh of Hiyangthang Mayai Leikai, Hiyangthang, Imphal West, Manipur – 795009.
  17. Shri Sapam Jiten Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Sapam Jugeshwor Singh of Langthabal Lep Awang Leikai, Canchipur, Manipur University, Imphal West, Manipur – 795003.

.... *Proforma Respondents*

**B E F O R E**  
**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

For the petitioner : Mr. R. Venkataramani, Attorney General for India  
Mr. Lenin Hijam, Advocate General of Manipur  
Mr. S. Chittaranjan, Additional Advocate General assisted by Mr. O. Ratankumar, Advocate [State of Manipur]  
**[in Rev. Pet. No. 33 of 2025, Rev. Pet. No. 34 of 2025 and Rev. Pet. No. 35 of 2025]**

: Mr. S. Biswajit, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Prabirkumar, Advocate and Mr. Sanatomba, Advocate  
**[in Rev. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, Rev. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 and Rev. Pet. No. 39 of 2025]**

For the respondents : Mr. HS. Paonam, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. A. Arunkumar, Advocate

: Mr. Ch. Momon, Advocate [State Election Commission]

: Ms. L. Ayangleima, Advocate

Dates of hearing : 15.12.2025, 12.01.2026,  
23.01.2026, 20.02.2026,  
25.02.2026, 13.03.2026,  
02.04.2026, 16.04.2026,  
28.04.2026, 06.05.2026

Date of judgment & order : **19.05.2026**

**JUDGMENT & ORDER**  
**(CAV)**

***[A. Guneshwar Sharma, JJ]***

[1] REV. PET. No. 33 of 2025, REV. PET. No. 34 of 2025 and REV. PET. No. 35 of 2025 are preferred by State of Manipur and REV. PET. No. 37 of 2025, REV. PET. No. 38 of 2025 and REV. PET. No. 39 of 2025 are preferred by third party review petitioners against the common judgment and order dated 29.08.2025 passed by Division Bench of this Court in writ appeals being W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 and W.A. No. 2011. Brief facts of the present review petitions (hereinafter referred to as 'RPs') and all miscellaneous cases (hereinafter referred to as 'MCs') sans details are as follows:

[2] The term of 5<sup>th</sup> Manipur Panchayat Election held in the year 2017 expired in the year 2022. Some of the elected members of Gram Panchayat (hereinafter referred to as 'GP') and Zila Parishad (hereinafter referred to as 'ZP') whose tenure have already expired in the year 2022, in 6 (six) districts of Manipur namely, Imphal East, Imphal West, Thoubal, Bishnupur, Kakching & Jiribam filed 3 (three) writ petitions being W.P.(C) 205 of 2023, W.P.(C) No. 266 of 2023 and W.P.(C) No. 239 of 2023 inter alia praying for a direction that they may be allowed to continue to function till elections are held for the new Panchayat i.e., 6<sup>th</sup> Panchayat. Vide common judgment and order dated 18.04.2023, Hon'ble Single Judge of this Court permitted

the outgoing members to function till elections are held for the next Panchayat as done in the case of 27 Urban Local Bodies as per order dated 19.01.2023 in W.P.(C) No. 935 of 2022. Being aggrieved by the common judgment and order, dated 18.04.2023, the State preferred 3 (three) writ appeals, being W.A. No. 9 of 2024 [arising out of W.P.(C) No. 205 of 2025], W.A. No. 10 of 2024 [arising out of W.P.(C) No. 266 of 2023] and W.A. No. 11 of 2024 [arising out of W.P.(C) No. 239 of 2023]. Main ground for filing the appeals is that the provisions of Section 22 of the the Act [i.e., The Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, (26 of 1994)] will not be applicable for continuation of the tenure of the 5<sup>th</sup> Panchayat whose tenure has already expired in the year 2022 beyond stipulated period of 5 (five) years. In the appeal, the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court framed 6 (six) questions of law for consideration as below:

- I. Whether the tenure of the Panchayat bodies established under Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (in short The Act) can be extended beyond the stipulated period of 5(five) years by Section 20 of the Act as well as in violation of the mandate of the Article 243E of the Constitution of India?
- II. Whether Section 22 of the the Act is transitional or permanent in nature?
- III. Who are competent to be appointed as members of the Administrative Committees within the meaning of Section 22(1) of the Act?
- IV. Whether the tenure of the elected members of the Panchayat be extended beyond 5(five) years period till the

elections are held in terms of the amended provision of Section 22(3) of the Manipur Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1996 [in short MPR (Amendment) Act, 1996]?

- V. What is the scope of Section 109 of the MPR Act, 1994 providing power to remove difficulties?
- VI. VI. Whether exercising power of the Section 109 of the MPR Act, 1994 can the tenure of the existing elected members or Administrative Committee for Gram Panchayat established under Section 22(1)(b) read with Section 22 (2) of the Act or Administrator for Zilla Parishad under Section 92 of the Act, be appointed for a tenure exceeding 6(six) months or till the elections are conducted?

[3] Vide order dated 29.08.2025, Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court allowed the appeal filed by the State of Manipur. The conclusions and decisions of the judgment are reflected in paragraph 64 which is reproduced herein below:

**'CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS'**

**[64]** *In view of the above findings, observations and directions, we hold and direct as follows:*

- i) The present writ appeals being W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 & W.A. No. 11 of 2024 are allowed and the directions of the Ld. Single Judge to allow the elected members to continue as members of Gram Panchayat and Zila Parishad till the election are held, are set aside.*
- ii) The tenure of Gram Panchayat cannot exceed the period of 5(five) years as mandated by Article 243E of the Constitution of India and Section 20 of the Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994.*
- iii) The provision of Section 22 of the Act is both transitional and permanent in nature.*
- iv) The amended provision of Section 22(3) of the Manipur Panchayati Raj Act as amended in 1996 does not confer any power to extend the tenure of the Gram Panchayat beyond the stipulated period of 5 years or till the election are conducted.*

- v) *All voters in the Gram Panchayat are eligible to be elected as members of the Administrative Committees under Section 22 of the Act.*
- vi) *When the elected members of the GP are appointed as members of the Administrative Committees, they will be eligible to exercise the functions and powers of the Gram Panchayat under Section 22(3) of the Act.*
- vii) *Section 109 of the Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 is a general clause empowering the authority to remove difficulties and in doing so, the Authority has no power to appoint Administrative Committees beyond the period of 6 months and/or till the election are notified.*
- viii) *All orders of appointment of the Administrative Committees of the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zila Parishad, issued by State Govt. in pursuance of the interim order dated 29.02.2024 for a term exceeding the period of 6 (six) months and till the election are held, are all set aside.*
- ix) *All other orders of appointment of the Administrative Committees of the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zila Parishad, issued by State Govt. for a term exceeding the period of 6 (six) months and till the election are held, are also all set aside.*
- x) *The State Govt. is directed to conduct fresh election within a period of 6 months.*
- xi) *Till the next election is conducted as directed in para (x) above, the State Govt. is at liberty to appoint fresh Administrative Committees for the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zila Parishad in terms of the provisions of Section 22, Section 92 and Section 109 of the Manipur Panchayati Raj, Act 1994 for a period not exceeding 6 months.'*

[4] State of Manipur filed 3 (three) review petitions being REV. PET. No. 33 of 2025 [arising out of W.A. No. 9 of 2024], REV. PET. No. 34 of 2025 [arising out of W.A. No. 10 of 2024] and REV. PET. No. 35 of 2025 [arising out of W.A. No. 11 of 2024]. Main grounds for filing the review petitions are:

Fixation of 6 (six) months period for appointment of Administrative Committees under Section 109 taking cue from Section 22 of the Act is without judicial mandate; direction to conduct elections within 6 (six) months

will be impracticable due to law and order issue, flooding or natural disasters, delimitation exercises or resource constraints; blanket invalidation of the appointments of Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zila Parishads without examination of their legality or necessity, violates principles of natural justice; administrative continuity in absence of elected bodies and their sudden removal of such committees will break down at the grassroot level; the direction in sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review empowering State to appoint Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zila Parishad for a period not exceeding 6 (six) months timelines, has created an administrative and policy road block for the Government. State Government also sought for review and implementation of direction with respect to tenure and power of Administrative Committees; interpretation of Sections 22 and 109 of the Act to ensure administrative continuity at local level.

[5] Some of the members of Administrative Committees appointed by the State whose appointments were quashed by the Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 29.08.2025, also filed 3 (three) review petitions being REV. PET. No. 37 of 2025 [arising out of W.A. No. 11 of 2024], REV. PET. No. 38 of 2025 [arising out of

W.A. No. 9 of 2024] and REV. PET. No. 39 of 2025 [arising out of W.A. No. 10 of 2024] with a limited prayer that they may be permitted to continue as members of the Zila Parishads and Chairpersons of Gram Panchayats till completion of works allocated to them; and also to allow them to take up ongoing works under various schemes and projects of 'Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme' ('MGNREGS' for the sake of convenience) till new Administrative Committees are constituted as per direction of this Court in judgment and order dated 29.08.2025 ('order under review' for the sake of brevity) passed in W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 and W.A. No. 11 of 2024.

[6] State of Manipur also filed miscellaneous application in review petition being MC(REV. PET.) No. 2 of 2026 inter alia praying for allowing them to appoint Administrative Committees for Zila Parishads till elections are held. Private respondents who are original writ petitioners, also filed a miscellaneous application in review petition being MC(REV. PET.) No. 3 of 2026 for setting aside letter dated 11.02.2026 and notification dated 16.02.2026 issued by the Deputy Commissioners of Imphal East, Imphal West, Thoubal, Bishnupur, Kakching & Jiribam for initiating process for appointment of Administrative Committees for the Gram Panchayats; as the same are against the directions in sub-paragraph (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review of the Hon'ble Division Bench dated

29.08.2025 in W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 and W.A. No. 11 of 2024.

[7] MC(REV. PET.) No. 2 of 2026 is filed by the State inter alia praying to restrict scope of review to sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 of the common judgment and order dated 29.08.2025; and to clarify and suitably modify sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the common judgment and order to permit the State to appoint Administrative Committees for Zila Parishads in accordance with law under Section 109 of the Act till conduct of fresh elections.

[8] As recorded in paragraph 4 of order dated 15.12.2025, Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India restricted the purview of the review to challenge sub-paragraph (viii), (ix), (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 of the common judgment and order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 and W.A. No. 11 of 2024 and again in paragraph 6 of order dated 16.04.2026, Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India further restricted the review to sub-paragraph (x) of Para No. 64 besides touching upon sub-paragraph (xi). In view of the above, the subject matter of review filed by State of Manipur, is now confined to sub-paragraph Nos. (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 of the common judgment and order dated 29.08.2025 qua direction for holding election within 6 (six) months and appointment of Administrative Committees for

Gram Panchayat and Zila Parishad in terms of provision of Sections 22, 92 and 109 of the the Act.

[9] For the sake of clarity and better understanding, the proceedings made by this Court in the earlier listings of review petitions are reproduced herein below:

**'13.11.2025.**

*This court is informed by Mr. I. Amri, learned State counsel on record for review petitioners that Attorney General would be appearing for the State review petitioners in the captioned matters and on that basis requests for an adjournment.*

*List under the cause list caption 'ADJOURNED ADMISSION' in the daily cause list on 01.12.2025.'*

**'01.12.2025.**

***Matter mentioned at 'half past ten'.***

[1] *Learned Attorney General, Mr. R. Venkataramani is before us on the Video Conferencing platform.*

[2] *Learned Advocate General, Mr. Lenin Hijam is before us in the physical Court. Learned State counsel, Mr. Dimal Kumar Haobam who is on record for the review petitioners submits that there is some inconvenience for Attorney General in appearing in person in these matters today and requests for re-scheduling of the captioned matters to 15.12.2025.*

[3] *Request acceded to.*

[4] *List on 15.12.2025.'*

**'15.12.2025**

[1] *Captioned 3 (three) review petitions have been filed by State seeking review of a 'common order dated 29.08.2025 made in Writ Appeal Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024' ('impugned order for the sake of convenience). To be noted, the order sought to be reviewed is being referred to as 'impugned order' for the sake of convenience as the order is not assailed by State and State seeks only a review that too a limited review about which there will be allusion infra.*

[2] *Learned Attorney General for India Mr. R. Venkataramani is before us on the V.C. (Video Conferencing) platform. To be noted, learned State Counsel Mr. O. Ratan Kumar who is in the physical*

*court before us is the counsel on record for the review petitioner and he is instructing learned Attorney General.*

*[3] Learned Attorney General submits that State is not assailing the impugned order by carrying it to Hon'ble Supreme Court. This submission is recorded.*

*[4] Learned Attorney General, adverting to paragraph No. 64 of the impugned order submits that 11 (eleven) subparagraphs thereof constitute the operative portion of the order and State in the captioned review petition is seeking review of only 4 (four) out of the 11 (eleven) sub-paragraphs viz., sub-paragraphs (viii) to (xi). Axiomatically, State accepts sub-paragraphs (i) to (vii) and State is giving legal quietus with regard to sub-paragraphs (i) to (vii) as learned Attorney General's further say.*

*[5] As regards the grounds of review, learned Attorney General fairly submits that the case of State may not fall within the first two categories viz., a) discovery of new/important matter and b) mistake/error on the face of record and it is further submitted that it would only fall within the third ground of any other sufficient reason which necessarily has to be read in the context of the first two grounds. It is submitted that the prevailing local scenario is new/important matter discovery of which was not possible at the time the impugnd order was made and that has necessitated the captioned review. Elaborating on this, it is submitted that State is under President's Rule and therefore, conduct of fresh elections within 6 (six) months at this juncture is not desirable and it may be desirable to conduct fresh elections after a popular Government is put in place or after the elapsing of the President's Rule which will be sometime in February, 2026.*

*[6] It is also submitted that with regard to 6 (six) months time frame qua appointment of Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayat Administrators, the feasibility of appointing new Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayat Administrators is being examined and the State will be able to revert to this Court on the same in January when the Court reopens after winter vacation.*

*[7] In the light of submissions of learned Attorney General, considering that State accepts impugnd order with the exception of the 4 (four) sub-paragraphs in the operative portion, this Court deems it appropriate to write that a prima facie case for issue of notice has been made out in the captioned review petitions.*

*[8] It is deemed appropriate to write that the 4 Clauses (4 subparagraphs in paragraph 64 which is operative portion of impugnd order) pertain to appointment of Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayats Administrators made either pursuant to the interim orders or in any other manner being set aside, State Government being directed to conduct the elections (local body elections) within a time frame of 6 (six) months and a further directive which says that State Government is at liberty to*

*appoint fresh Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayats till the election is conducted albeit within 6 (six) months. For the sake of convenience, we deem it appropriate to extract and reproduce the 4(four) sub-paragraphs qua which review is sought the same read as follows :*

*'(viii) All orders of appointment of the Administrative Committee of the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad, issued by State Govt. in pursuance of the interim order dated 29.02.2024 for a term exceeding the period of 6 (six) months and till the election are held, are all set aside.*

*(ix) All other orders of appointment of the Administrative Committee of the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad, issued by State Govt. for a term exceeding the period of 6 (six) months and till the election are held, are also all set aside.*

*(x) The State Govt. is directed to conduct fresh election within a period of 6 months.*

*(xi) Till the next election is conducted as directed in para (x) above, the State Govt. is at liberty to appoint fresh Administrative Committee for the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad in terms of the provisions of Section 22, Section 92 and Section 109 of the Manipur Panchayati Raj, Act 1994 for a period not exceeding 6 months.'*

*[9] Issue notice to respondents in all 3 (three) captioned review petitions and all the 3 (three) captioned MCs thereat.*

*[10] Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel who is present in court accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 in Review. Petition No. 33 of 2025. Ms. L. Ayangleima, learned counsel who is present in court accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Petition No. 33 of 2025 and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel who is present in court accepts notice for Respondent No. 12 in Review. Petition No. 34 of 2025. As regards the other respondents and respondents in Review Petition No. 35 of 2025, issue notice returnable by 12.01.2026. Dasti service is also permitted.*

*[11] Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior advocate appearing on behalf of Mr. A. Arunkumar who has accepted notice for Respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 in Review. Petition No. 33 of 2025 submits on instructions that contempt petition being Cont. Case(C) No. 140 of 2025 (already filed) will not be pursued and same can be kept in abeyance until the captioned review petitions are decided one way or the other. This submission made by learned senior advocate, on instructions, at the Bar is recorded.*

*[12] List on 12.01.2026.'*

### **'12.01.2026**

*[1] Learned Attorney General for India Sri R. Venkataramani was before this Court on the V.C. (Video Conferencing) platform and senior advocate Mr. H.S. Paonam instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel on record for respondents No. 1, 2, 3 and 6 in Review. Petition No. 33 of 2025; for the respondent Nos. 4 to 9 in*

*Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025; for respondent Nos. 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 in Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 in Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 is before us in the physical court. To be noted, learned Attorney General is instructed by Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State Counsel who is before us in the physical court before this Court.*

*[2] Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 9 to 15 in Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Pet. No. 33 of 2025 and Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record for review petitioners in Review. Petition Nos. 37, 38 and 39 of 2025 are before this Court in the physical court.*

*[3] Adverting to paragraph 6 of earlier proceedings of this Court made in the listing on 15.12.2025, learned Attorney General for India submitted that he has advised the Government and the same is under active consideration. Let the suggested interim arrangement be placed before this court by way of a State affidavit (State Counsel undertakes to file on or before 15.01.2026 with advance copies to all other counsel) as regards afore-referred paragraph 6 of 15.12.2025 proceedings.*

*[4] As regards the main matters, it was submitted by counsel on record on both sides that they may require some time to complete pleadings so that there can be a productive hearing in the next listing which will be on 23.01.2026 (Friday).*

*[5] List on 23.01.2026.'*

### **'23.01.2026**

*In the hearing today, learned Attorney General for India Shri R. Venkataramani along with learned Advocate General Mr. Lenin Hijam instructed by Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned Counsel for State, Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel on record for respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 in review petition No.33 of 2025; for the respondent Nos. 4 to 9 in Review Petn. No.37 of 2025; for respondent Nos. 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17 19 and 20 in Review. Petn. No.39 of 2025 and for respondent Nos.16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 in Review Petn. No.38 of 2025; Mr.S. Biswajit, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record for review petitioner in Review. Petn. No.37, 38 and 39 of 2025 and Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 9 to 15 in Review Petn. No.38 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Petn. No.33 of 2025 are before this Court.*

*2. At the outset, adverting to the earlier proceedings of this Court dated 12.01.2026 more particularly paragraph 3 thereat, learned Attorney General submitted that State, on his advice suggested some interim arrangement and the same has been placed before this Court in the form of an affidavit dated 22.01.2026. Learned Attorney General draws the attention of this Court to paragraphs 8-10 of the said affidavit and submits that section 22 of Manipur Panchayat Raj Act 1994 (Act 26 of 1994) read with section 109 would enable to put a place in principle whereby Deputy*

*Commissioners can be entrusted with the interim arrangement duties. In response to this, learned senior counsel Mr. H.S. Paonam and Mr. S. Biswajit submitted that they need to bring on record their objections and both learned senior counsel submitted that their respective instructing counsel/ counsel on record will bring on both objections by way of reply affidavit.*

*3. In the interregnum, it was agreed by all the counsel before this Court that there will be a pre hearing conference (pre hearing conference learned Attorney General, all learned senior counsel, State counsel and all counsel on record) and the purpose would be to try and arrive at an interim arrangement which is acceptable to all.*

*4. It was also agreed that the pre hearing conference will be at 11.00 a.m tomorrow (i.e., 24.01.2026 Saturday in Imphal). Learned Advocate General graciously agreed to co-ordinate logistics of the meeting.*

*5. Let the matter stand over to 24.02.2026 for objections to be brought on record and for hearing on same.*

*6. Though obvious, this Court deems it appropriate to write that in the interregnum if any interim arrangement is agreed upon i.e., if any interim arrangement acceptable to all concerned is arrived at in the pre hearing conference tomorrow, it would be open to the parties to mention for having the matter listed for further orders in this regard.*

*7. List on 24.02.2026.'*

### **'20.02.2026**

*[1] Matter mentioned at half past ten.*

*[2] Learned Attorney General for India Mr. R. Venkataramani was before us on the Video Conferencing (V.C.) platform. Learned State Counsel Mr. O. Ratan Kumar who is in the physical court is instructing the learned Attorney General. To be noted, learned Attorney General is appearing along with learned Advocate General of State of Manipur Mr. Lenin Hijam, who is before us in physical court.*

*[3] The request of learned State Counsel is to renotify the captioned matters.*

*[4] Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel for respondents and Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba, learned counsel for review petitioners are also present in court.*

*[5] In the light of certain reservations expressed by learned senior counsel Mr. HS Paonam, learned Attorney General in his usual fairness submitted that the order that is sought to be reviewed is an order dated 29.08.2025 being a common order made in 3 (three)*

*Writ Appeals viz., WA Nos. 9 to 11 of 2024, the sum and substance or in other words, the crux and gravamen of this 29.08.2025 order is given by way of a summation in paragraph 64 of the order vide an adumbration of 11 (eleven) sub-paragraphs, as only review applications are pending as of today and as there are no interim orders, the 11 (eleven) sub-paragraphs of paragraph 64 which is both summation of the order as well as the operative portion of the order continue to operate and it will continue to operate until any further orders are made by this Court subject only to any proceedings/observations made by this Court thus far in the captioned main matters. This stated position, puts to rest apprehensions raised by Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel.*

*[6] To be noted, main matters which were last listed on 23.02.2026 now stand over to 24.02.2026. Therefore, the captioned cluster of matters will also now stand over to 24.02.2026.*

*[7] Re-notified at the request of learned State Counsel Mr. O. Ratan Kumar.*

*[8] List on 24.02.2026.'*

**'24.02.2026**

*[1] Matter mentioned at half past ten.*

*[2] Mr. O. Ratan Kumar, learned State Counsel requested for a short accommodation stating that learned Attorney General for India who is leading him will be in the midst of a hearing in Hon'ble Supreme Court.*

*[3] Request acceded to.*

*[4] List tomorrow in the Special Bench at 2 P.M.*

*[5] List on 25.02.2026.'*

**'25.02.2026**

*[1] Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings more particularly, the proceedings dated 23.01.2026.*

*[2] In the hearing today, learned Attorney General for India Shri R. Venkataramani was before this Court on the Video Conferencing (VC) platform and he is instructed by learned State Counsel Mr. O. Ratan Kumar who is before us in the physical Court. Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba and Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 9 to 15 in Review Petn. No.38 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Petn. No.33 of 2025 and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) are before this Court.*

[3] After some arguments, it was submitted by all counsel that the earlier pre-hearing conference held on 24.01.2026 in Imphal remains inconclusive and that it is desirable to try and conclude the same.

[4] Learned Attorney General for India, all the afore-referred learned senior counsel, counsel, agreed to have another pre-hearing conference in the ensuing Yaoshang holidays so as to come up with possible suggestions. Though obvious, we make it clear that the court will ultimately take a call qua any suggestion.

[5] In the interregnum, as regards State Election Commission, (in the light of sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 of the order sought to be reviewed) shall place before this Court a timetable for conducting the elections to the local bodies (Gram Panchayats and Zilla Parishads) in the next listing. It is made clear that the timetable shall give firm dates for various stages of the election process i.e., from Notification, polling declaration of results, etc.

[6] All the learned senior counsel and counsel very fairly submitted that they would coordinate with the office of the learned Attorney General regarding logistics of the meeting (pre-hearing conference) and this Court is informed by learned Attorney General that Advocate General for State of Manipur would also participate in the meeting as in the previous meeting on 24.01.2026.

[7] Mr. Biswajit, learned senior counsel, on instructions, submitted that he will place before this Court details of payments that have to be made to contractors for work that has been done hitherto.

[8] Let the matter stand over to 13.03.2026.

[9] List on 13.03.2026.'

**'13.03.2026**

[1] Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listings, more particularly the proceedings made in the previous listing on 25.02.2026 which reads as follows:

'25.02.2026

[1] Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings more particularly, the proceedings dated 23.01.2026.

[2] .....  
.....  
.....

[8] .....

[9] List on 13.03.2026.'

[2] In the hearing today, Mr. R. Venkatarami, learned Attorney General for India instructed by Mr. Kartikay Agrawal, learned

*counsel is before this Court on the Video Conferencing (VC) platform, Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General instructed by Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. A. Arukumar, learned counsel, Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba and Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 9 to 15 in Review Petn. No.38 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Petn. No.33 of 2025 and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) are before this Court.*

**[3]** *Adverting to paragraph 4 of the earlier proceedings, learned Attorney General for India and senior counsel/counsel before this Court, submitted that a pre-hearing conference was held in New Delhi on 09.03.2026 (Monday). It was submitted that a further meeting here in Manipur with learned Advocate General and other senior counsel/counsel, in continuation of earlier meeting is necessary.*

**[4]** *After the meeting, if the afore-referred learned senior counsel and counsel come up with suggestions/proposals, it is made clear that the same will be considered by this Court, taking into account larger public interest i.e., it would be considered without restricting it or limiting it to the lis alone.*

**[5]** *Adverting to paragraph 5 of our earlier proceedings, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) submitted that the office of State Election Commissioner is lying vacant. This Court finds that State Election Commission has to be constituted by the Government. This is vide Section 98 of 'the Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (26 of 1994)' (hereinafter 'said Act' for the sake of brevity), 'Government' is defined vide Section 2(g) of said Act and it is 'State Government of Manipur'. Learned Attorney General and Learned Advocate General fairly submitted that they will play necessary advisory roles qua appointment of State Election Commissioner.*

**[6]** *In the light of the narrative thus far, let this matter stand over to 02.04.2026. To be noted, 02.04.2026 is a date agreed by senior counsel and counsel before this Court and all counsel requested for listing on 02.04.2026.*

**[7] List on 02.04.2026.'**

**'02.04.2026**

**[1]** *Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings, more particularly, the proceedings made in the previous listing on 13.03.2026.*

**[2]** *In the hearing today, Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned senior counsel and learned Advocate General for State of Manipur instructed by Mr. O. Ratan Kumar, learned State Counsel, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar,*

*learned counsel on record, Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) are before us in the physical court and Mr. Kartikay Agrawal, learned counsel from the office of the learned Attorney General for India is before us on the Video Conferencing (V.C.) platform.*

*[3] Adverting to earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 13.03.2026, all the learned senior counsel and counsel before us submitted that a pre-hearing conference was held and another sitting is scheduled to be held in Delhi on Sunday i.e., 05.04.2026. All the learned senior counsel and learned counsel submitted that it would be desirable to have the captioned matters listed on 16.04.2026.*

*[4] Be that as it may, paragraph 5 of proceedings made in the previous listing on 13.03.2026 reads as follows :*

***[5]** Adverting to paragraph 5 of our earlier proceedings, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) submitted that the office of State Election Commissioner is lying vacant. This Court finds that State Election Commission has to be constituted by the Government. This is vide Section 98 of 'the Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (26 of 1994)' (hereinafter 'said Act' for the sake of brevity), 'Government' is defined vide Section 2(g) of said Act and it is 'State Government of Manipur'. Learned Attorney General and Learned Advocate General fairly submitted that they will play necessary advisory roles qua appointment of State Election Commissioner.'*

*[5] Adverting to afore-referred paragraph 5, learned Advocate General, on instructions, submitted that the needful is being done, the exercise is being taken forward and he is hopeful of having the exercise completed at the earliest.*

*[6] In the light of the narrative thus far, list the captioned matter before this Special Division Bench on 16.04.2026 at 2:00 P.M.'*

#### **'16.04.2026**

*[1] Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India instructed by Mr. Kartikay Agrawal, learned counsel, Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General of Manipur instructed by Mr. O. Ratankumar, learned State counsel, Mr. Dimalkumar Haobam, learned State counsel, Mr. I. Amri, learned State counsel, Ms. Sharmila Rahman, learned State counsel, Mr. S. Chittaranjan, learned Additional Advocate General of Manipur for State of Manipur and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur are before this Court (Physical Court).*

[2] Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel on record for respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 6 in Review Petition No. 33 of 2025, Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel on record for respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review Petition No. 33 of 2025 and Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. Sanatomba, learned counsel on record and Mr. H. Pravirkumar, learned counsel on record for petitioners in Review Petition No. 37 of 2025, Review Petition No. 38 of 2025 and Review Petition No. 39 of 2025 are before this Court (Physical Court).

[3] Learned Attorney General for India continued and concluded his submissions.

[4] The following 2 (two) points which are relevant to legal drill at hand emerge:

- (i) there is an amendment to 'Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (26 of 1994)' ('said Act' for the sake of brevity and convenience). In and vide this amendment 30 Sections i.e., Sections 110 to 139 have been added to the said Act and the same have been slotted under Chapter – VI. These 30 Sections kicked in i.e. came into force on or from 22.02.2023;
- (ii) adverting to our earlier proceedings made in the listing on 13.03.2026, more particularly paragraph 5 thereat, learned Attorney General for India on instructions submitted that State Election Commissioner has since been appointed vide an order dated 15.04.2024 bearing reference No. Com-3/2/2026/SEC-LAW. A scanned reproduction of this order placed before this Court is as follows:



[5] The following 3(three) points unfurled in the hearing:

- (i) *as regards MC(REVIEW PET.) No. 2 of 2026 taken out by State, learned Advocate General of Manipur on instructions submitted that in limb No. (iii) of the prayer the expression '**till the conduct of fresh election**' is not being pressed and that the same can be treated as deleted. This submission is recorded and MC(REVIEW PET.) No. 2 of 2026 will now be considered on this basis;*
- (ii) *adverting to sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 of order dated 29.08.2025 (order sought to be reviewed), it was submitted by Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur that election for local bodies will positively be conducted within 6 (six) months from today i.e. on or before 16.10.2026. In this regard, it was further submitted by learned standing counsel that elections will be so conducted as per amended said Act more particularly the amendment qua tiers (3 tiers). It was also submitted by learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur that determination of elected members as per Section 99 of the said Act would be done on the basis of 2011 Census. This submission made on instructions by learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur is recorded as a undertaking given to this Court. Be that as it may, learned standing counsel volunteered to file an affidavit of undertaking in this regard;*
- (iii) *adverting to sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order that is sought to be reviewed i.e. common order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 and W.A. No. 11 of 2024, learned Attorney General for India submitted on instructions that as regards the liberty given to State Government qua appointment of Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zilla Parishads inter-alia vide Sections 22 and 92 respectively of said Act, the State Government has embarked upon the exercise and would complete the exercise as expeditiously as possible.*

*[6] As regards other aspects of the matter, adverting to proceedings made on 15.12.2025, more particularly Paragraph 4 thereat, it was submitted by learned Attorney General for India that though it was earlier submitted that the review is confined to four Sub-paragraphs of Paragraph 64 namely, sub-paragraph Nos. (viii) to (xi), it is now confined to sub-paragraph (x) besides touching upon sub-paragraph (xi) which read as follows:*

*[64] In view of the above findings, observations and directions, we hold and direct as follows:*

- i) .....
- ix) .....
- x) *The State Govt. is directed to conduct fresh election within a period of 6 months.*
- xi) *Till the next election is conducted as directed in para (x) above, the State Govt. is at liberty to appoint fresh Administrative Committees for the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad in terms of the provisions of Section 22, Section 92 and Section 109 of the Manipur Panchayati Raj, Act 1994 for a period not exceeding 6 months.'*

[7] *After conclusion of submissions of learned Attorney General for India and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur, Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel on record very fairly submitted that with regard to conduct of elections to local bodies within 6 (six) months from today about which there is allusion elsewhere supra in this order, he is on the same page and he supports the submissions made by learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur and this submission is recorded. To be noted, in this regard, Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. Sanatomba, learned counsel on record submitted that he also supports the submissions made by Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur and this submission is also recorded.*

[8] *Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel submitted that with regard to the liberty given to State Government vide Sub-paragraph (xi) of Paragraph 64 of the order sought to be reviewed and the exercise which State Government has embarked upon, he has some submissions to be made. Be that as it may, learned senior counsel submitted that the review itself is not maintainable and pressed into service oft quoted, celebrated '**Padma Sundara Rao & Ors. -vs- State of Tamil Nadu & Ors.'** [(2002) 3 SCC 533] and adverted to paragraph 15 thereat regarding cases on issues and as to when cases on issues which is a construction principle can be supplied by Court. '**Inderchand Jain -vs- Motilal'** [(2009) 14 SCC 663] was also relied upon and paragraph 33 thereat was adverted to five principles propounded by Hon'ble Supreme Court regarding review jurisdiction.*

[9] *Thereafter the learned senior counsel expressed difficulty at his end in continuing submissions today/tomorrow and requested for rescheduling the captioned matter to another date.*

[10] *In the next listing, the affidavit alluded to supra in this order shall be filed by Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur and Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior*

*counsel will continue and conclude his submissions followed by Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel and reply, if any, on behalf of State.*

*[11] List under cause list caption 'PART HEARD' on 28.04.2026.'*

**'28.04.2026**

**[1]** *Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 16.04.2026 which reads as follows:*

*[1] Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India instructed by Mr. Kartikay Agrawal, learned counsel, Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General of Manipur instructed by Mr. O. Ratankumar, learned State counsel, Mr. Dimalkumar Haobam, learned State counsel, Mr. I. Amri, learned State counsel, Ms. Sharmila Rahman, learned State counsel, Mr. S. Chittaranjan, learned Additional Advocate General of Manipur for State of Manipur and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commissioner, Manipur are before this Court (Physical Court).*

*[2] .....  
.....  
.....*

*[10] .....*

*[11] List under cause list caption 'PART HEARD' on 28.04.2026.'*

**[2]** *At the outset, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned Standing counsel for State Election Commission, Manipur, advertng to sub-paragraph (ii) of paragraph 5 of afore-referred earlier proceedings dated 16.04.2026 submitted that an affidavit of undertaking dated 27.04.2026 has been filed. A scanned reproduction of this affidavit (sans the cause title) is as follows:*



**[3]** As regards the paragraph 1 of the afore-referred affidavit of undertaking, there is no difficulty and the same is taken on file. As regards paragraph 2, it talks about 2001/2011 census though it was earlier submitted by learned Standing Counsel for State Election Commission that Section 99 drill {Section 99 of Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (26 of 1994)} which has been referred to as 'said Act' in the previous proceedings dated 16.04.2026} will be as per 2011 census. Paragraph 2 of the afore-referred affidavit of undertaking talks about 2001/2011 census. It was pointed out that paragraph 2 therefore is not in complete consonance with the submission made earlier.

**[4]** Mr. Ch. Momon, learned Standing Counsel for State Election Commission sought time to file a better affidavit of undertaking with annexures if so desired and if so advised. As regards paragraph 2 alone, to be noted paragraph 1 has been taken on file as already alluded to.

**[5]** Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel adverting to paragraph 8 of the earlier proceedings dated 16.04.2026 submitted that State Government has since appointed Administrative Committees and has published the same in official Gazette dated 28.04.2026 today (to be noted, the appointment is vide proceedings dated 27.4.2026). A scanned reproduction of the Gazette publication (sans annexures/which contains the names of the appointees) is as follows:



**[9]** Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior counsel added that with regard to constitution of Administrative Committees (which according to Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior counsel has nullified his further submissions) there has been no transparency. Responding to this as well as the earlier submissions of learned senior counsel Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned AG pressed into service Rattanindia case law being **Rattanindia Power Limited reported in 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2936** for the principle that a respondent cannot question the correctness of an order without filing an appeal, cross-appeal or cross-objection and for the further principle that the person who fails to file an appeal or cross-objection can be taken as one who is not aggrieved by the operative part of the order.

**[10]** Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior counsel and Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior counsel submitted that the orders appointing Administrative Committees should be kept in abeyance but this Court is of the considered view that if aggrieved by the orders, it is open to the parties concerned to assail the same in a manner known to law for being decided on its own merits and in accordance with law and we are not inclined to pass any interim order in this regard in this proceeding.

**[11]** To enable Mr. Ch. Momon, learned Standing Counsel for State Election Commission to file a better affidavit of undertaking and Mr. W. Sanatomba, learned counsel who is instructing Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior counsel to place before this Court the order of Hon'ble Supreme Court arising from the PIL, let these matters stand over to 06.05.2026 before this Special Bench at 2:00 pm.

**[12]** List on 06.05.2026.'

#### **'06.05.2026**

**[1]** In the hearing today, Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General along with Mr. S. Chittaranjan, learned Additional Advocate General instructed Mr. Ratan Kumar Oinam, Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, Mr. I. Amri, Mr. Dimal Kumar Haobam, Ms. Sharmila and Mr. A. Priyokumar Sharma, learned State counsel for review petitioners in Review. Pet. No. 33 of 2025, Review. Pet. No. 34 of 2025 and Review. Pet. No. 35 of 2025, Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba and Mr. H. Prabirkumar, learned counsel for review petitioners in Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 and Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 6 in Review. Pet. No. 33 of 2025, respondent Nos. 1,2 & 3 in Review. Pet. No. 34 of 2025, respondent Nos. 4-9 in Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, respondent Nos. 16-19 & 21 in Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 and respondent Nos. 10-12, 14-17, 19 & 20 in Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur), Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 11-17 in Review. Pet. No. 33 of 2025 and respondent Nos. 9-15 in Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 are before this Court (physical Court).

**[2]** Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel continued and concluded his submissions. Thereafter, Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel completed his submissions. Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General completed his submissions. Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commission also completed his submissions. Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel submitted that she is adopting the submissions made by learned Advocate General.

**[3]** Adverting to earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 28.04.2026, more particularly, paragraph 10 thereof, Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel on instructions from Mr. W. Sanatomba, learned counsel, submitted that Writ Petitions being W.P. (C) No. 324 of 2026 and W.P. (C) No. 325 of 2026 have since been filed.

**[4]** Be that as it may, adverting to earlier proceedings, Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel submitted that additional affidavit dated 04.05.2026 on behalf of respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 6 has since been filed in Review. Pet. No. 33 of 2025 and the same is on record.

**[5]** Likewise, adverting to earlier proceedings, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur), submitted that affidavit dated 05.05.2026 sworn by State Election Commissioner has been filed and the same is before this Court.

**[6]** Mr. W. Sanatomba, learned counsel on record for review petitioners in Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, Review. Pet. No.38 of 2025 and Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025, submitted that an affidavit dated 05.05.2026 has been filed in Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025 and the same is before this Court.

**[7]** To be noted, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel and Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel made short reply submissions.

**[8]** **Hearing concluded.**

**[9]** Captioned matters will now stand over for consideration and verdict. To put it differently, 'ORDERS RESERVED'.

**[10]** The reason for filing third party review petition is that the petitioners are not party before the Writ Court as well as Appellate Court and the directions in sub-paragraph (viii) and (ix) of paragraph 64 of the order under review dated 29.08.2025, set aside all the Administrative Committees, which appointments exceed the period of 6 (six) months and till elections are held; and their appointments as members of the Administrative Committees were also set aside

without hearing them. The ground for review is that the Administrative Committees, appointed to discharge the function of Panchayat till elections are held, are discharging important functions such as, implementation of various programmes specially execution of works under MGNREGS.

[11] When the matter was listed on 13.03.2026, both Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India and Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General of Manipur submitted that an endeavor would be made for appointment of State Election Commissioner in terms of Section 98 of the Act. As per assurance given before this Court in order dated 13.03.2026, the State Government has appointed Shri M. Joy Singh, IAS (Retd.) as State Election Commissioner vide order dated 15.04.2026.

[12] In the proceedings held on 16.04.2026, Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India for the first time submitted before this Court that Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 was amended by amendment No. 2/20/2022-Leg/L, dated 22.02.2023 by introducing 'Chapter – VI containing Sections 110 to 139' and the amendment of 2023 came into force w.e.f. 22.02.2023. It is submitted that by this amendment of 2023, 2 (two) tier Panchayati Raj System has become 3 (three) tier Panchayati Raj System. It is also further clarified that the amendment was introduced on the direction of Hon'ble Supreme Court in order dated 09.08.2021 in SLP(C) No.

11724 of 2021 [The State of Manipur -vs- Maisnam Manikchand Singh & Ors].

[13] Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India has pointed out that inadvertently the amendment of 2023 could not be placed before the Hon'ble Division Bench in appeals. However, the same is placed before this Court for consideration in the review petitions as the structure of Panchayat has changed from 2 (two) to 3 (three) tier by this amendment of 2023 w.e.f. 22.02.2023.

[14] In the proceedings made on 16.04.2026, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commission, on instructions, submitted that elections would be positively conducted within a period of 6 (six) months i.e. on or before 16.10.2026 and it will be as per amendment of 2023 qua 3 (three) tier Panchayati Raj and determination of elected members as per Section 99 of the the Act shall be done on the basis of 2011 census.

[15] Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India, however, clarified that since the State Election Commission has undertaken to conduct election within a period 6 (six) months, i.e., on or before 16.10.2026, the review petitions may be disposed of by giving time extension for holding election on the basis of direction in sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 of the order under review dated 29.08.2025 passed by the Division Bench of this Court and also in terms of liberty given in sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the

order under review, liberty may be granted to the State Government to appoint Administrative Committees for Panchayats and Zila Parishads in terms of Sections 20, 92 and 109 of the the Act.

[16] In the same proceedings made on 16.04.2026, Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel for some of the private respondents (original writ petitioners) and Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel for third party review petitioners (members of Administrative Committees quashed by this Court in the order under review) fairly submitted that they support submissions of learned Attorney General for India and standing counsel for State Election Commission with regard to conduct of election within a period of 6 (six) months from date of order i.e. on or before 16.10.2026. However, Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel submitted that with respect to the liberty given to the State Government by sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review, review is not maintainable and he refers to the decision of Constitution Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Padma Sundara Rao & Ors. -vs- State of Tamil Nadu & Ors.**' [(2002) 3 SCC 533] [Paragraph 15] regarding two principles of construction of statute and also '**Inderchand Jain -vs- Motilal**' [(2009) 14 SCC 663] [Paragraph 33] that 5 (five) principles propounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court regarding review jurisdiction, are not satisfied in the present case.

[17] When the matter was taken up on 28.04.2026, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commission submitted that an affidavit of undertaking dated 27.04.2026 was filed in terms of order dated 16.04.2026 whereby the Commission undertook to conduct election within 6 (six) months for local bodies and election would be conducted as per amended provision of the Act more particularly, amendment qua 3 (three) tier and stated determination of elected members as per Section 99 of the Act would be done on the basis of 2001/2011 census. Since affidavit of undertaking was not in conformity with undertaking made in the order dated 16.04.2026, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commission sought some more time for filing a better affidavit of undertaking.

[18] In the proceedings made on 28.04.2026, Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel for private respondents (original writ petitioner) submitted that vide orders dated 27.04.2026 and published in Manipur Gazette on 28.04.2026, Deputy Commissioners of 6 (six) districts namely, Imphal East, Imphal West, Thoubal, Bishnupur, Kakching and Jiribam, issued orders for appointment of Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats. It is pointed out that appointment of new Administrative Committees appointed vide orders, dated 27.04.2026 (published in the Manipur Gazette on 28.04.2026), issued by Deputy Commissioners of the aforementioned 6 (six) districts, is

nothing but an endeavor to overreach the Court by the State Government and has nullified any other submissions on question of permissibility of appointment of Administrative Committees. Learned senior counsel for writ petitioners submitted that the same is in violation of understanding during the pre-hearing sittings held between the learned Attorney General for India, learned Advocate General of Manipur, learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the parties to find out amicable settlement.

[19] Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel has fairly submitted that he supports the undertaking of the State Election Commission to hold election within the period of 6 (six) months, i.e., on or before 16.10.2026. However, he has reservation about maintainability of the review petitions qua sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review dated 29.08.2025 regarding liberty given to the State Government for appointment of Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zila Parishads in terms of Sections 22, 92 and 109 of the Act. It is sum and substance of his submission that the Administrative Committees could not be appointed multiple times during a term of a Panchayat.

[20] Even if the Deputy Commissioners have been empowered to appoint Administrative Committees for Panchayat for a period of 6 (six) months under Section 22 of the Act (as held in sub-paragraph

(vii) of paragraph 64 of the order under review), Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel has vehemently urged that such appointment of Administrative Committees could not be resorted to after expiry of 6 (six) months period; otherwise the same would defeat the provisions of Article 243E of the Constitution of India and Section 20 of the Act which fixed the tenure of Panchayat at 5 (five) years as held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in a catena of cases and also in sub-paragraph (ii) of paragraph 64 of the order under review. Learned senior counsel for the writ petitioners submitted that review petitions filed by the State are not maintainable as extension of time does not fall within the scope of review under Order XLVII CPC, 1908 and decision in ***'Inderchand Jain -vs- Motilal' [(2009) 14 SCC 663]***.

[21] Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel for the writ petitioners submitted that the order under review was passed on 29.08.2025. In the said order under review, there is a direction in sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 to conduct election within a period of 6 (six) months. Manipur was under President's Rule w.e.f. 13.02.2025 and learned senior counsel further pointed out that Article 243E [Part - IX (Panchayat) of the Constitution of India] was not suspended by the promulgation of President's Rule vide order dated 13.02.2025 and hence, existence of President's Rule is not a sufficient ground for failure of State Government to conduct election within 6 (six) months. He, further, refers to the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the

case of ***Suresh Mahajan –vs- State of Madhya Pradesh [(2022) 12 SCC 770 paragraph 12]***. The learned senior counsel for writ petitioners also submitted that subsequent orders dated 27.04.2026 (published in Gazette on 28.04.2026) of Deputy Commissioner for appointing Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats during the pendency of present writ petition ought to be set aside, as the same is an endeavor to overreach this Court. The learned senior counsel refers to the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Malleeswari –vs- K. Suguna [2025 SCC OnLine SC 1927]*** [Paragraph 17] where it has been held that review will be maintainable only on (i) discovery of new and important matter or evidence which was not within the knowledge of petitioner at the time of passing original order; (ii) mistake or patent error apparent on the face of record; or (iii) for any sufficient reason which is analogous to two other categories already mentioned. For the same proposition, learned senior counsel also relies on the decision of ***Madhusudhan Reddy –vs- V. Narayan Reddy & Ors. [(2022) 17 SCC 255 (paragraph 33)]***.

[22] Learned senior counsel has further pressed into service a decision of a Division Bench of Allahabad High Court in ***Prem Lal Patel –vs- State of U.P. & 3 Ors. [2000 SCC OnLine ALL 312]***. The State Government introduced an ordinance ***Uttar Pradesh (Panchayat) Laws (Amendment) Ordinance 2000*** empowering State to appoint

Administrative Committees in place of Panchayati Raj, if the State Election could not be held within the stipulated time and the same was set aside by the Division Bench of the High Court as it suffered from repugnancy to the Constitutional provision containing Article 243E and 243K of the Constitution of India. By this case law, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel for the writ petitioners has tried to impress upon this Court that Administrative Committees cannot be appointed in any case and elections have to be conducted within a stipulated time. Learned senior counsel also referred to the celebrated decision of ***Raj Narayan –vs- Indira Nehru [1975 Suppl. SCC 1 para 587]*** where Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the rule of construction of statutes that "*.....an expressly laid down mode of doing something necessarily prohibits the doing of that thing in any other manner.*"

[23] Learned senior counsel relies on another decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***GVK Industries Limited & Anr. –vs- Income Tax Officer & Anr. [(2011) 4 SCC 36 (Paragraph 81)]*** which clarifies the maxim '*the Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*' – the express mention of one thing implies the exclusion of another. Since Manipur Panchayati Raj Act does not provide appointment of multiple Administrative Committees during the tenure of a Panchayat, he emphasizes that such appointment has to be excluded by this principle. Further, learned senior counsel also relies on a decision of

Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of ***State of West Bengal –vs- Aninidya Sundar Das [ (2022) 16 SCC 318 (Paragraph 57)]*** to the fact that in the guise of removing difficulties, the State cannot change the scheme and essential provisions of the Act. This decision is cited to buttress the proposition that multiple Administrative Committees cannot be appointed exercising the powers conferred to the State under Section 109 of the Act for removing difficulties. In the conclusion, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel for the writ petitioners submitted that the submission of the State as well as the State Election Commission for holding the election within a period of 6 (six) months i.e., on or before 16.10.2026 is accepted by the writ petitioners. But the review is not maintainable for modification of subparagraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review to enable the State to appoint multiple Administrative Committees till elections are held. Learned senior counsel also makes a submission that the State Government as well as State Election Commission may be directed to complete the process for fresh election within this stipulated period of time and further time should not be extended for conducting election, as it will defeat the Constitutional mandate in Article 243E of the Constitution as well as the mandatory provision of Section 20 of the Act prescribing the period of 5 (five) years as tenure of Payachayat body.

[24] Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of third party review petitioners has fairly submitted that petitioners have accepted the submissions of State Government and State Election Commission for holding of election within 6 (six) months. Learned senior counsel further submitted that they accepted the decision of the Division Bench in the order under review dated 29.08.2025 and the proposition of the law laid down in the judgment that terms of the Panchayat is for 5 (five) years; tenure cannot be extended beyond 5 (five) years; and terms of Administrative Committees and Administrators appointed under Section 22, 92 and 109 of the Act cannot exceed the period of 6 (six) months. However, the learned senior counsel has pointed out that the third party review petitioners are members of the Administrative Committees (appointed by the State in terms of the interim order dated 29.02.2024 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 and W.A. No. 11 of 2024 permitting the State for appointment of Administrative Committees); and their appointments were set aside by the sub-paragraph (viii) and (ix) of paragraph 64 of the order under review without affording them an opportunity of being heard. He further states that one important fact could not be placed before the Division Bench about the necessity of continuation of the work undertaken by the existing Administrative Committees for implementation of various schemes during course of hearing. The

members of the Administrative Committees are exercising powers of the Panchayat under Section 22 of the Act and most of the welfare schemes in the rural area are executed through the Panchayat specially the works under MGNREGA. The petitioners have done certain works and bills are yet to be paid to the executing agency and members of the Administrative Committees have not been paid any honorarium throughout their tenure. Hence, a limited prayer is made in the 3 (three) review petitions i.e., Rev. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, Rev. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 and Rev. Pet. No. 39 of 2025 that the State Government may be directed to allow the third party review petitioners to continue as members of the Administrative Committees and permit them to continue to execute pending works undertaken by them till new Administrative Committees are appointed, as directed by the Division Bench in the order under review.

[25] Both Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel and Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel for the parties submitted that the Administrative Committees appointed vide orders dated 27.04.2026 (notified in Gazette on 28.04.2026) be kept in abeyance. However, in order dated 28.04.2026 this Court did not pass any interim order regarding stay of the appointment of new Administrative Committees and left the issue open to the party to assail the same in appropriate proceedings, if they are aggrieved by such appointments.

[26] Contrary to the submissions of Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel for the writ petitioners questioning permissibility of appointment of Administrative Committees on multiple occasions, Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel for the third party review petitioners, has fairly submitted that review petitioners are not challenging the powers of State Government to appoint Administrative Committees, as the writ petitioners themselves were members of the Administrative Committees appointed on earlier occasion and having participated the pre-hearing meeting with the learned Attorney General for India, learned Advocate General, learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the parties, to work out an amicable settlement of the issues involved in the review petitions including appointment of the Administrative Committees.

[27] Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel for the third party petitioners has submitted that after fresh appointment of Administrative Committees vide orders dated 27.04.2026 (notified in Gazette on 28.04.2026), the prayer in the third party review petitions has shrunk to release all the honorarium and pending bills for the works undertaken during the tenure of petitioners as members of the Administrative Committees. Learned senior counsel concludes his submissions that the State authority may be directed to release the honorarium and pending bills of the works executed during the tenure

of the third party review petitioners as members of the Administrative Committees.

[28] In terms of the liberty given by this Court in order dated 28.04.2026, Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior counsel for the third party review petitioner has submitted that the two writ petitions, being W.P.(C) No. 324 of 2026 and W.P.(C) No. 325 of 2025 have been filed by third party review petitioners and others who were erstwhile members of the Administrative Committees, challenging the new appointments of the Administrative Committees vide orders dated 27.04.2026 (notified in Gazette on 28.04.2026) with respect to Imphal West and Kakching; and the same are pending before Hon'ble Single Bench of this Court for adjudication.

[29] Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General of Manipur has stated that the review petitions are filed by the State for the purpose to remove certain difficulties. Initially review is preferred by raising certain points of law on merit against the directions in paragraph 64 of the impugned order. Later on, the scope of review is restricted to sub-paragraph (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review.

[30] Learned Advocate General of Manipur draws the attention of this Court to paragraphs 61 and 63 of the order under review dated 29.08.2025 where it has been held that the Deputy Commissioners/State have/has power to appoint the Administrative



Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zila Parishads under Sections 22, 92 and 109 of the Act, not exceeding the period of 6 (six) months.

[31] Learned Advocate General of Manipur has also pointed out that the findings in paragraphs 61 and 63 of the order under review have been fructified in sub-paragraph (vii) of paragraph 64 of the imugned order. However, he has further urged that scope of the review petitions is confined to giving extension of time for holding election and also extension of time permitting appointment of Administrative Committees/Administrators for Gram Panchayats and Zila Parishads. The power given to the State authority to appoint Administrative Committees/Administrators has already been approved by the Division Bench in paragraphs 61 and 63 and sub-paragraph (vii) of the paragraph 64 of the judgment under review and the issue becomes no longer *res integra*. Reverting to the submission of Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel to the effect that State authority has no power to make appointment of multiple Administrative Committees within a tenure of Panchayat, learned Advocate General of Manipur has vehemently submitted that the writ petitioners did not file any review or appeal against the order under review dated 29.08.2025 and having fully accepted the judgment in totality, it does not lie in the mouth of the writ petitioners to raise competency of the State authority for appointment of Administrative Committees. In this

regard, learned Advocate General has cited recent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Rattanindia Power Limited – vs- Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited & Anr. [2025 SCC OnLine 2936 (Paragraphs 47, 48, 50, 51)]*** to the proposition that when a person who fails to file an appeal or cross-appeal, he can be taken that he is not aggrieved by the operative part of the order against which, or some part of which, the appeal is filed by some other person. Learned Advocate General has argued that the writ petitioners (private respondents herein represented by Mr. HS. Paonam) do not have locus to challenge the appointment of Administrative Committees, having failed to challenge the findings at paragraph Nos. 61, 63 and 64 (viii) of the order under review and it is submitted that the objection raised by the writ petitioners may be rejected on this ground alone.

[32] Mr. Ch. Momon, learned standing counsel for State Election Commission submitted that as permitted by this Court in order dated 28.04.2026 for filing a better affidavit / undertaking with respect to paragraph 2 of the earlier affidavit dated 27.04.2026, a new better affidavit on behalf of State Election Commission dated 05.05.2026 has been filed stating that State Election Commission be permitted to conduct election as per list of electors notified by the State Government under Section 15 of the Act and further the Commission may be allowed to conduct election on the basis of

established norms within time stipulated by this Court. A scanned reproduction of the substantive part of the affidavit dated 05.05.2026 sans cause title is as follows:



[33] Learned standing counsel for State Election Commission concludes with the prayer that the Commission may be permitted to conduct election within a stipulated period, i.e., on or before 16.10.2026 in terms of the available electorate record and as per

Section 15 of said Act for 3 (three) tier election of Panchayat. We are refraining from going into electorate record, i.e., as to whether it should be as per 2001 or 2011 census, as it is outside the remit of the instant review. The reason is this was not put in issue when the order under review was made. We make it clear that all questions in this regard are left open.

[34] Ms. L. Ayangleima, learned counsel for some of the private respondents (interveners in WPs/WAs) adopts the submissions of learned Advocate General of Manipur.

[35] We have considered the submissions made by the parties and case laws referred at the Bar. In view of the undertakings by Mr. R. Venkataramani, learned Attorney General for India appearing for the State of Manipur in the proceedings dated 15.12.2025 and 16.04.2026, the scope of review petition is confined to sub-para (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review dated 29.08.2025. For the sake of convenience, sub-paragraph (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review is reproduced herein below:

- x) The State Govt. is directed to conduct fresh election within a period of 6 months.*
- xi) Till the next election is conducted as directed in para (x) above, the State Govt. is at liberty to appoint fresh Administrative Committees for the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad in terms of the provisions of Section 22, Section 92 and Section 109 of the Manipur Panchayati Raj, Act 1994 for a period not exceeding 6 months.'*

[36] Before further proceeding, it will be appropriate to reproduce the relevant provisions of the law i.e., Article 243E of the Constitution, Sections 17, 20, 22, 49, 92 & 109 of the Act and Section 6 of the MPR (Amendment) Act, 1996 and the same is reproduced below:

**'Article 243E.** *Duration of Panchayats, etc.- (1) Every Panchayat, unless sooner dissolved under any law for the time being in force, shall continue for five years from the date appointed for its first meeting and no longer.*

*(2) No amendments of any law for the time being in force shall have the effect of causing dissolution of a Panchayat at any level, which is functioning immediately before such amendment, till the expiration of its duration specified in clause (1)*

*(3) An election to constitute a Panchayat shall be completed-*

*(a) before the expiry of its duration specified in clause(1);*

*(b) before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution;*

*Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Panchayat would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this clause for constituting the Panchayat for such period.*

*(4) A Panchayat constituted upon the dissolution of a Panchayat before the expiration of its duration shall continue only for the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Panchayat would have continued under clause (1) had it not been so dissolved.*

#### ***The Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994***

**Section 17.** *A Gram Panchayat shall consist of the Pradhan and such number of directly elected members as may be notified from time to time by the State Government and one member for every 350 population or part thereof of the Panchayat area shall be elected as a member of such Panchayat.*

**Section 20.** *Term of the Gram Panchayats.—*

*(1) Every Gram Panchayat shall continue for a term of five years from the date appointed for its first meeting and no longer:*

*Provided that a Gram Panchayat which is functioning immediately before the commencement of this Act shall continue till the expiration of its duration.*

*(2) The election to constitute a Gram Panchayat shall be completed—*

*a) before the expiration of its duration specified in sub-section (1); and*

*(b) in case of dissolution, before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of dissolution:*

*Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Gram Panchayat would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this clause for constituting the Gram Panchayat for such period.*

*(3) A Gram Panchayat constituted upon the dissolution of a Gram Panchayat before the expiration of its duration, shall continue only for the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Gram Panchayat would have continued under sub-section (1) had it not been so dissolved.*

**Section 22.** *Appointment of an Administrative Committees or Administrator on failure to elect members of Gram Panchayat and in other cases.— (1) (a) If the Deputy Commissioner is satisfied that a Gram Panchayat for a village or group of villages immediately after the establishment of such Gram Panchayat cannot be constituted by reason of—*

*(i) any difficulty in holding an election of the members of the Gram Panchayat; or*

*(ii) failure to elect such members at two successive elections held under section 17; or*

*(iii) any other sufficient reason whatsoever; or*

*(b) If at any general election to a Gram Panchayat, no member is elected or less than two-third of the total number of members are elected, the Deputy Commissioner shall, by notification either,—*

*(i) appoint an Administrative Committees consisting of persons qualified to be elected, the number of such persons being equal to the number of members determined under section 17; or*

*(ii) appoint an Administrator.*

*(2) The members of the Administrative Committees or the Administrator shall hold office for such period not exceeding six months as the Deputy Commissioner may specify in the notification under sub-section (1).*

*(3) On the appointment of an Administrative Committees or an Administrator under sub-section (1), the persons, if any, chosen as members of the Gram Panchayat before*

*such appointment shall cease to be members of the Gram Panchayat and all the powers and duties of the Gram Panchayat shall be exercised and performed by such Administrative Committees or Administrator, as the case may be.*

*(4) The Administrative Committees or Administrator shall be deemed to be a duly constituted Gram Panchayat for the purpose of this Act, notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing provisions: Provided that if at any time after the appointment of the Administrative Committees or the Administrator under sub-section (1), the Deputy Commissioner is satisfied that there is no difficulty in duly constituting the Gram Panchayat by election of members, the Deputy Commissioner, may, notwithstanding that the term of office for which the members of the Administrative Committees or the Administrator had been appointed has not expired, direct by notification that the members of the Administrative Committees or the Administrator, as the case may be, shall cease to hold office with effect from such date as may be specified in such notification.*

**49.** *Composition of Zilla Parishad.—The Zilla Parishad shall consist of—*

*(a) the members directly elected from the territorial constituencies in the district under section 50;*

*(b) the members of the House of the People and the members of the State Legislative Assembly representing a part or whole of the district whose constituencies lie within the district; and*

*(c) ten per cent. of the Pradhans of the Gram Panchayats in the district:*

*Provided that when the total number of members under clauses (b) and (c) exceed the total number of members under clause (a), only one-third of the members under clause (c) shall be selected on rotation for a period of one year by lot as the Government may decide from time to time and district to district, subject to the condition that a Pradhan who was a member under this clause for one year shall not be eligible to become member for a second term during the remainder of his term of office as Pradhan:*

*Provided further that all members of the Zilla Parishad whether elected or not from territorial constituencies in the Zilla Parishad area shall have the right to vote in the meeting of the Zilla Parishad*

*except in the election of Adhyaksha and Up-Adhyaksha.*

**92.** (1) Whenever, -

*(a) any general election to a Zila Parishad under this Act or any proceedings consequent thereon has been stayed by an order of a competent court or authority; or*

*(b) all the member or more than two thirds of the members of a Zila Parishad have resigned, the Government shall by notification in the Official Gazette appoint an Administrator for such period as may be specified in the notification and may, by like notification, curtail or extend the period of such appointment, so however, that the total period of such appointment shall not exceed six months.*

*(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, on the appointment of an Administrator under sub-section (1) the Zila Parishad and the Committees thereof and the Adhyaksha or Up-Adhyaksha of such Zila Parishad charged with carrying out the provisions of this Act, or any other law, shall cease to exercise any powers and perform and discharge any duties or functions conferred or imposed on them by or under this Act or any other law and all such powers shall be exercised and all such duties and functions shall be performed and discharged by the Administrator during the period of such appointment.*

**109.** *Removal of difficulties.— If any difficulty arises in giving effect to the provisions of this Act, the Government, may by order, published in the Official Gazette as the occasion may require, do anything which appears to it to be necessary to remove the difficulty.*

### ***The Manipur Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1996***

#### **6. Amendment of Section 22:-**

*In section 22 of the Act:-*

*(a) sub-clause (ii) of clause (b) of sub-section (1) shall be deleted.*

*(b) In sub-section (2), the words "or an Administrator" shall be deleted.*

*(c) In sub-section (3), for the words "cease", the word "continue shall be substituted and the words" or an administrator" and "or Administrator, as the case may be" shall be deleted.*

*(d) In sub-section (4) the words "or Administrator", "or the Administrator" and "or the Administrator, as the case may be" shall be deleted.*

*(e) after sub-section (4), the following sub-section (5) shall be inserted, namely:-*

*"(5) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Act, if the State Government is satisfied that the first elections to Gram Panchayats after the commencement of this Act can not be held, the State Government may appoint Administrative Committees to exercise the powers and to perform the duties and functions of the Gram Panchayat for a period not exceeding six months."*

[37] From the above, it is admitted position that in terms of the mandate of Article 243E of the Constitution, the duration of Panchayat is 5 (five) years and elections have to be concluded before the expiry of 5 (five) years tenure or within the period of 6 (six) months from its premature dissolution. The same is also stipulated in Section 20 of the Act. However, on failure to elect members of the Gram Panchayats, Deputy Commissioners have power under Section 22(1)(a)(ii)&(iii) to appoint Administrative Committees consisting of persons qualified to be elected as members of Gram Panchayats; as per sub-clause (2) of Section 22, the Administrative Committees shall hold office for a period not exceeding 6 (six) months; and in terms of sub-clause (3), Administrative Committees shall have power as members of the Panchayats. Sub-clause (4) provides that if the Gram Panchayat is duly constituted, the Deputy Commissioner shall notify that the Administrative Committees shall cease to function notwithstanding the tenure of 6 (six) months has lapsed or not. In paragraph 56 of the order under review, it was held that

Administrative Committees can be appointed when there is a failure to hold election or result of the election is not effective in terms of sub-clause (b) of Section 22.

[38] In the present case, 5<sup>th</sup> Manipur Panchayat Election was conducted in the year 2017 and the tenure of the 5<sup>th</sup> Panchayat expired in 2022. Thereafter, the election could not be conducted till date as stipulated in Article 243E of the Constitution and Section 20 of the Act. By common judgment and order dated 18.04.2023 of the Hon'ble Single Judge in W.P.(C) No. 266 of 2023, W.P.(C) No. 205 of 2023 and W.P.(C) No. 239 of 2023, the elected representatives of Gram Panchayats (whose tenure have already expired in the year 2022, of 6 (six) districts namely, Imphal East, Imphal West, Thoubal, Bishnupur, Kakching and Jiribam) were permitted to function till issuance of notification for fresh election. The direction of the Hon'ble Single Judge was set aside by the Division Bench of this Court in the order under review dated 29.08.2025 passed in W.A. No. 9 of 2024, W.A. No. 10 of 2024 and W.A. No. 11 of 2024 preferred by the State Government making substantive findings in paragraph 64 of the judgment and order inter alia holding that tenure of the Panchayat would be 5 (five) years and Administrative Committees/Administrators appointed under Sections 22, 92 and 109 of the Act cannot exceed the period of 6(six) months; appointment orders of Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zila

Parishads beyond the period of 6 (six) months and till elections are conducted were set aside; direction to the State Government to conduct fresh election within a period of 6 (six) months; and liberty was given to State Government to appoint fresh Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zila Parishads in terms of the provisions of Sections 22, 92 and 109 for the period not exceeding 6 (six) months.

[39] In terms of the undertaking given by the learned Attorney General for India, the scope of review is now reduced to sub-paragraph (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 regarding direction for conducting of election within 6 (six) months and liberty to appoint fresh Administrative Committees and Administrators for Gram Panchayats and Zila Parishads till elections are held for a period not exceeding 6 (six) months. State of Manipur has also filed MC(Rev. Pet.) No. 2 of 2026 reiterating that the scope of review is confined to sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 of the imugned order dated 29.08.2025 and to clarify and suitably modify sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 to permit State Government to appoint Administrative Committees for Zila Parishads for wider representation in place of Administrators in accordance with Section 109 of the Act till conduct of election in public interest.

[40] As recorded in the proceedings dated 16.04.2026, learned Advocate General of Manipur submitted that from the prayer

limb (iii) of MC(Rev. Pet.) No. 2 of 2026, the words 'till conduct of fresh election in public interest', on being not pressed for, stand deleted and substantive prayer (iii) in MC(Rev.Pet.) No. 2 of 2026 confines to clarification, modification and correction of sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review dated 29.08.2026 to permit the State Government to appoint Administrative Committees of Zila Parishads in place of Administrators in terms of Section 109 of the the Act. It is the submission of both learned Attorney General for India and learned Advocate General of Manipur that Deputy Commissioners have been appointed as Administrators for Zila Parishads for 6 (six) districts. But keeping in mind this aspect, the Administrative Committees consisting of multiple members for Zila Parishads will be more representative and will be able to carry out multifarious tasks of Zila Parishads. It has been pointed out that in paragraph 61 of the order under review, the Division Bench has already held that Administrative Committees can be appointed under Section 109 of the Act to meet certain exigencies. Since Section 109 of the Act is a general provision without any details and in order to have objectivity in the appointment of Administrative Committees within the parameters of the Act, it has been held that Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats appointed under Section 109 of the Act read with Section 22 of the Act cannot exceed a period of 6 (six)

months and should be in terms of the Administrative Committees appointed under Section 22 of the Act.

[41] We have perused the provisions of Section 92 of the Act. As per sub-clause (1) of Section 92, State Government has power to appoint Administrators for Zila Parishads for a period not exceeding the period of 6 (six) months if - (a) any general election to a Zila Parishad or any proceeding consequent upon has been stayed by an order of competent Court or authority; or (b) all the members or more than 2/3 of the members of the Zila Parishad have resigned. It is clear from a plain reading of the provision of Section 92(1) that the State Government can appoint Administrators of a Zila Parishad only in two conditions: (i) when general election of Zila Parishad has been stayed by competent Court or authority; or (ii) all the members or more than 2/3 of the members of the Zila Parishad have resigned. The appointment of Administrators should not exceed a period of 6 (six) months.

[42] In the present case, the tenure of 5<sup>th</sup> Manipur Panchayat including Gram Panchayats and Zila Parishads has already expired in the year 2022 and no election has been conducted. In sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the imugned order, the State Government was given liberty to appoint Administrative Committees for Gram Panchayats and Administrators for Zila Parishads in terms of

provisions of Sections 22, 92 and 109 of the Act for as period not exceeding 6 (six) months.

[43] On careful reading of Section 92 of the Act, it is as clear as daylight that the appointment of Administrator for Zila Parishads of Panchayat whose tenure have already expired, is not contemplated under Section 92(1) of the Act. It is neither a case of stay of the election of the Zila Parishad by a competent Court or authority nor a case where more than 2/3 members of the Zila Parishad have resigned. In the present scenario of 5<sup>th</sup> Panchayat of Manipur (tenure already expired), appointment of Administrator of Zila Parishad is not within the ambit of Section 92(1) of the Act. It may be noted that in paragraph 61 of the order under review dated 29.08.2025, the Division Bench also held that in order to remove difficulties, State authority has power to appoint Administrative Committees exercising the extraordinary power under Section 109 of the Act and with respect to Administrative Committees for Panchayat, the principle laid down in Section 22 of the Act has been adopted to the extent that Administrative Committees should not exceed period of 6 (six) months and shall consist of equal number of members who are eligible to be appointed as such. This finding was given reading together Section 109 and Section 22 of the Act in harmony so that any exercise for removing difficulties and appointment Administrative Committees shall not violate the mandatory provisions of Section 22 of the Act in

respect of Administrative Committees of Gram Panchayat. As a corollary of the finding in paragraph 61 of the order under review and in view of the non-applicability of the provisions of Section 92(1) of the Act, to the fact of the present case of expiry of tenure of the Panchayat, we permit the State authority to appoint Administrative Committees for Zila Parishad for a term not exceeding 6 (six) months and not exceeding number of members of Zila Parishad as defined in Section 49 of the Act (as amended) in exercise of extraordinary power for removing of difficulties in Section 109 of the Act read with Section 92 of the Act. Partial review of directions in sub-paragraph (x) and (xi) of paragraph 64 of the judgment and order under review dated 29.08.2025 is permissible under third limb of Ordre XLVII Rule 1 CPC.

### **CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS**

[44] Accordingly, we partly allow the review petitions being Rev.Pet. No. 33 of 2025, Rev.Pet. No. 34, 2025 and Rev. Pet. No. 35 of 2025 filed by State to the extent that:

- (i) by modifying sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 of the order under review dated 29.08.2025 to the effect that State authority and State Election Commission are permitted to conduct election within the agreed extended time, i.e., on or before 16.10.2026 for 3 (three) tier

Panchayat election in terms of the Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 as amended in 2023 ('said Act' for convenience);

(ii) sub-paragraph (xi) of paragraph 64 of the order under review is modified to the extent that State Government is permitted to appoint Administrative Committees for Zila Parishads whose tenure have already expired, in exercise of power under Section 109 for removing of difficulties of the said Act read with Section 92 of the said Act consisting of members who are eligible to be members of Zila Parishad and not exceeding number of members as stipulated in Section 49 of the said Act;

(iii) the question of permissibility or impermissibility for appointment of Administrative Committees for more than one time (multiple times) during the tenure of Panchayat, is not an issue involved in the review petitions and therefore the same is left open to be adjudicated in appropriate proceedings;

(iv) subsequent appointment of Administrative Committees for 6 (six) districts namely, Imphal East, Imphal West, Thoubal, Bishnupur, Kakching and Jiribam vide different notifications dated 27.04.2026 (notified in Gazette on 28.04.2026) are left open to be adjudicated in appropriate proceedings.

[45] Review Petitions being Rev. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, Rev. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 and Rev. Pet. No. 39 of 2025 are disposed of with a direction to the State authority to release amounts of honorarium due and pending bills, to third party review petitioners for works executed by them as members of Administrative Committees (whose appointment orders have been quashed by order under review dated 29.08.2025) adopting procedures in vogue.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications are disposed of as closed.

**JUDGE**

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**FR/NFR**

*Bipin*