

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

MC(Cont.Cas(C))No. 13 of 2026

Ref: Cont.Cas(c)No.83 of 2024

Mr. Tourangbam Brajakumar Singh, aged about 59 years,
S/o (L) Tourangbam Brajamani Singh of Uripok
Tourangbam Leikai, PO & PS Imphal, Imphal West District,
Manipur.

Applicant

Vs.

Mr. Phurailatpam Vivekananda Sharma, aged about 55
years, S/o (L) Ph. Tomba Sharma of Keishamthong Top
Leirak, PO & PS Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur &
5 Ors.

Respondents

BEFORE

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH
(ORDER)**

(Order of the Court was made by Mr. M. Sundar, CJ)

26.02.2026

[1] Captioned miscellaneous case (MC) has been taken out by a respondent in a pending contempt case namely Cont.Cas(C)No.83 of 2024. To be noted, MC applicant is respondent No.6 (R6) in the Contempt case.

[2] Prayer in the captioned MC is as follows:

*In the present facts and circumstances, it is humbly prayed
that Your Lordship may be gracious enough to close the*

above-referred contempt petition, in light of the Order dated 16.05.2024 issued by the Joint Secretary (DP) Government of Manipur otherwise, pass an innocuous order that the pendency of the above-referred contempt petition shall not bar or prejudice any process for consideration of appointment on promotion to the post of Director (For. Env't. & CC), Manipur on a regular basis so as to render absolute justice.

[3] Short facts are that the afore-referred contempt case has been filed by one Mr. Phurailatpam Vivekananda Sharma (1st respondent in WA No.112 of 2023) complaining of non-compliance qua a common order dated 09.02.2024 made in WA No.112 of 2023 to WA No. 115 of 2023 ('said order' for the sake of convenience and clarity).

[4] Considering the limited scope of captioned MC, suffice to write that vide said order, a Division Bench made it clear that State is permitted to undertake the exercise of consideration for appointment of in-charge Director (Environment and Climate Change), Manipur afresh in accordance with law and in accordance with two office memoranda one dated 03.10.2020 and another dated 09.03.2021 within a period of eight weeks without being bound by certain findings returned by Hon'ble Single Bench out of which intra-court appeal in which said order was made arose.

[5] Complaining of non-compliance, afore-referred contempt case has been filed by one Mr. Phurailatpam Vivekananda Sharma who as already alluded to supra is 1st respondent in WA No.112 of 2023. There

are 8 (eight) respondents in all in the contempt case, all 8(eight) respondents have entered appearance through counsel, as regards R6 affidavit in response has also been filed and the same is on board.

[6] It is in the aforesaid scenario that captioned MC has been taken out, more so when the contempt case is scheduled to be listed on 17.03.2026.

[7] We heard Mr. Maibam Rendy Singh, learned counsel on record for applicant.

[8] After some arguments, when it was pointed out that whether 16.05.2024 proceedings bearing reference No. COURT-1/68/2023-DP-DP will amount to compliance qua said order is a matter which has to be decided in the contempt case, learned counsel submitted that he is giving up the first part of his prayer. This submission is recorded. Learned counsel submitted that as regards the second part of his prayer, he wants a clarification that pendency of contempt petition will not bar or prejudice any process for consideration of appointment on promotion to the post of Director (For. Env't. & CC), Manipur on a regular basis.

[9] In our considered view, such a prayer amounts to seeking a clarification of said order i.e., order dated 09.02.2024 made in WA No.112 of 2023 to WA No.115 of 2023 though the MC prayer talks about clarification qua pendency of contempt petition.

[10] Be that as it may, the scope of a contempt petition or in other words, legal perimeter within which a contempt petition should

perambulate is such that clarification of such nature that too at the instance of one of the respondents will be clearly impermissible. In this view of the matter, we are not inclined to issue notice in the captioned MC. However, we make it clear that all questions are left open for being canvassed in the main contempt case.

[11] Captioned MC is rejected and we refrain from imposing costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

John Kom