Item – 75

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL

WP(C) No. 240 of 2017

Thangneikhup Karong

... Petitioner/s

- Versus -

Union of India & 4 Ors.

... Respondent/s

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MV MURALIDARAN

29.01.2020

The writ petition was filed seeking the prayers as follows:-

(i) Admit the writ petition and Issue rule Nisi calling upon the respondents to show cause as to why a writ/order/direction in the nature of Certiorari or any order appropriate Writ/Order/direction(s) should not be issued for quashing and setting aside the impugned Signal dated 10.03.2017 (at Annexure A/9) and the impugned order dated 31.03.2017 (at Annexure A/16) and any consequential orders, in the facts and circumstance of the present petition;

(ii) To show cause as to why a Writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ/order/direction(s) should not be issued directing the respondents to allow the petitioner to remain at 32 Bn by virtue of the Signal dated

17.02.2017 (at Annexure-A/5).

(iii) Make the Rule absolute;

(iv) To pass any appropriate order or direction(s) which may be appropriate to be passed under such facts and circumstance of the instant case, for the ends of justice.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has produced an order passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 371 of 2017 dated 18.10.2019 in which this Court passed the following orders:-

> *"a) the writ petition Nos. 371 of 2017, 346 of 2017, 372 of 2017, 397 of 2017, 398 of 2017 & 408 of 2017 are disposed of by directing the petitioners to make fresh representations to the respondent authorities within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order,*
>
> *b) The respondent authorities shall consider such representations within a period of two months thereafter, after affording a reasonable opportunity to the petitioners,*
>
> *c) Till the representations are considered by the respondent authorities as stated above,* ***the interim order granted earlier shall continue.*** *If no representation is made as per the time prescribed, then the respondent authorities may proceed in accordance with law.*
>
> *d) In view of the orders passed in the above writ petitions, the contempt petitions in Cont.Cas(C) No.95 of 2017 & Cont.Cas(C) No.96 of 2017 are closed as infructuous."*

Today, I heard Mr. M. Devananda, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. S. Samarjeet, learned CGC and perused the order passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 371 of 2017 dated 18.10.2019.

The learned counsel for the respondent has made no objection that if this Court is inclined to pass the order passed in the above writ petition being WP(C) No. 371 of 2017 dated 18.10.2019, the respondent will be inclined to consider the fresh representation which is to be filed by the petitioner and pass suitable orders.

Therefore, it is made clear that nothing prejudicial to the respondent, this Court is inclined to pass the same orders based on the orders passed in WP(C) No. 371 of 2017 dated 18.10.2019.

Therefore, I am inclined to pass the following order:-

a) the writ petition being WP(C) No. 240 of 2017 is disposed of by directing the petitioner to make fresh representation to the respondent authorities within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order;

b) The respondent authorities shall consider such representation within a period of two months thereafter, after affording a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner;

c) Till the representation is considered by the respondent authorities as stated above, **the interim order granted earlier shall continue.** If no representation is made as per the time

prescribed, then the respondent authorities may proceed in accordance with law.

JUDGE

-Larson