

OINAM
THOIBA MEITEI

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

Item no. 121-123

Digitally signed by
OINAM THOIBA MEITEI
Date: 2025.11.06
17:14:39 +05'30'

**MC(W.P. (C) No. 338 of 2025 with
MC(W.P. (C)) No. 209 of 2025 with
W.P. (C) No. 223 of 2025**

Rommel Ahongsangbam

... Applicant

- Versus -

M/s Luxmi Self Employed Youth Group

... Respondent

**B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

ORDER

05.11.2025

[1] Present Ms. Y. Jinita, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Y. Ashang, learned GA along with Mrs. R.K. Emily, learned Dy. GA on behalf of the State respondent nos. 1 & 2 and Mr. L. Raju, learned counsel for the respondent nos. 3 & 4 (Imphal Municipal Corporation).

[2] By the present petition, the petitioner challenged the impugned order dated 10.03.2025 issued by the Municipal Commissioner, Imphal Municipal Corporation (IMC) given 5(five) nos. of public parking slot to respondent no. 5. Steps has been taken to respondent no. 5, however, none appears on behalf of the respondent no. 5.

[3] Vide order dated 20.03.2025, this Court kept in abeyance the impugned order dated 10.03.2025 with respect to public parking slot at sl. no. 4 which is earlier allotted to the petitioner and interim order has been extended from time to time.

[4] During the course of hearing, Mr. L. Raju, learned counsel for the respondent nos. 3 & 4 (IMC) produces an order dated 06.10.2025 whereby, it is stated that public parking slot at sl. no. 4 of the impugned order dated

10.03.2025 which is earlier allotted to the petitioner and now allotted to the respondent no. 5 has been cancelled and the same has been allotted to the petitioner. In the circumstances, the cause of the writ petition does not survive and the writ petition may be closed as infructuous.

[5] Ms. Y. Jinita, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Y. Ashang, learned GA for the State respondents submit that this Court may pass appropriate order in terms of the order dated 06.10.2025 issued by the IMC.

[6] This Court has perused the materials on record, the impugned order dated 10.03.2025 and the subsequent order dated 06.10.2025. Since, the public parking slot at sl. no. 4 allotted to the respondent no. 5 has been cancelled by the subsequent order and the same has been restored to the petitioner and the cause of the writ petition does not survive.

[7] However, this Court does not express any opinion on the legality of the subsequent order dated 06.10.2025.

[8] With these observations, the W.P. (C) No. 223 of 2025 is closed as infructuous.

[9] Earlier interim order is merged with the final order.

[10] The MC(W.P. (C)) No. 338 of 2025 & MC(W.P. (C)) No. 209 of 2025 are also closed accordingly.

JUDGE

Thoiba