

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

Rev.Pet.(J2) No. 2 of 2025

PG Chunhemlung, aged about 43 years, S/o. PG Gaidinrei, resident of Guigailong, Langol, Imphal West, Manipur, Proprietor of M/S Swang Dwang (SD), having its office at Guigailong, Langol Imphal West, Manipur – 795004.

Petitioner

-Versus-

DP Korungthang, aged about 39 years, S/o. Medun Maring, resident of Lamlong Khullen, Chandel, Manipur – 795135.

Respondent

BEFORE

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR

For revision petitioner	Mr. Leo N., Advocate
Date of Order	11.06.2026

ORDER

[1] Captioned review petition has been filed seeking review of an 'order dated 24.04.2025 made in CRP(CRP.Art.227) No. 24 of 2024' ('said CRP order' for convenience). Mr. Leo N., learned counsel on record for review petitioner who is before this Court submits that said CRP order was carried to Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court disposed of the Special Leave Petition (SLP) in and by an order dated 19.12.2025. Mr. Leo N., learned counsel on record for review petitioner has placed before this Court order of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 19.12.2025 and scanned reproduction of the same is as follows:

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 15058-59 OF 2025
[@ SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NOS. _____ OF 2025]
[DIARY NO. 67442 OF 2025]

DP KORUNGTHANG

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

25175369

PG CHUNHEMLUNG

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Certified to be true copy

[Signature]
Assistant Registrar
Supreme Court of India


1. Delay condoned.
2. Leave granted.
3. These appeals are filed against the Judgment and Orders dated 24.04.2025 and 19.08.2025 passed by the High Court of Manipur in CRP No. 24 of 2024 and Rev. Pet. No. 2 of 2025 respectively.
4. By the first order, the High Court restored the suit that was decreed *ex-parte*, subject to the condition that the appellant deposits an amount of Rs.5 Lakhs.
5. The respondent filed a Review Petition against the order dated 24.04.2025 and the same was allowed by the second order impugned before us, directing that the entirety of the decretal amount should be paid. Thus, the appellant/defendant is before us.
6. Taking into account the fact that the appellant, as an Officer of the State, is posted outside the State and is, in fact, working as a Constable, we deem it appropriate to grant him the opportunity to contest


the suit filed against him on merits. In these circumstances, we set aside the *ex-parte* decree dated 21.12.2022 and restore the suit, subject to the appellant depositing an amount of Rs. 2 Lakhs before the Trial Court within a period of four weeks from today.

7. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we direct that the suit shall be taken up and decided as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six months from today.

8. With these directions, the appeals stand disposed of.

9. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, is/are disposed of.


[PAMIDIGHANTAM SRI NARASIMHA]

 J.
[ATUL S. CHANDORKAR]

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 19, 2025.

[2] In the light of afore-referred order of Hon'ble Supreme Court captioned review petition has become infructuous, is learned counsel's say. Learned counsel, saying so, sought leave of this Court to withdraw the captioned review petition and learned counsel made an endorsement in the case file in this regard and scanned reproduction of the endorsement is as follows:

Noting by office or Advocate
1.
I, Leo N Adv, hereby withdraw the Review Petition as it has become 'infractionous' 11/6/2026. <u>Leo N.</u>

[3] Be that as it may, as regards the sole respondent in the captioned review petition, this order has to be read in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the listing on 16.12.2025 which reads as follows:

'16.12.2025

Mr. K.R. Pamei, learned counsel for review petitioner is before this Court and learned counsel requests for an accommodation citing difficulty for the arguing counsel.

Be that as it may, in the last 2(two) listings on 14.10.2025 and 18.11.2025 there was no representation for the respondent, the proceedings made in these two listings are as follows:

'14.10.2025

Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. Leo N., learned counsel for review petitioner is before this Court but there is no representation for respondent.

With the intention of giving one more opportunity to respondent and learned counsel for respondent, let captioned matter stand over by four weeks.

List on 18.11.2025.'

'18.11.2025

Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 14.10.2025, which reads as follows:

'14.10.2025

Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. Leo N., learned counsel for review petitioner is before this Court but there is no representation for respondent.

With the intention of giving one more opportunity to respondent and learned counsel for respondent, let captioned matter stand over by four weeks.

List on 18.11.2025.'

Today Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. Leo N., learned counsel for review petitioner, is before this Court but there is no representation for the respondent either in the physical Court or on the V.C. platform.

As this is the second consecutive listing in which there is no representation for respondent, it is made clear that in the next listing also if there is no representation for the respondent, the matter will be heard out on the basis of available records, case file and after hearing learned counsel for review petitioner.

Let the matter stand over to 16.12.2025 albeit with the aforementioned caveat.

List on 16.12.2025.'

To be noted, today also there is no representation for respondent either in the physical Court or on the Video Conferencing (V.C.) platform.

In the light of the earlier proceedings and in the light of there being no representation for the respondent today also, it is made clear that the captioned matter will be taken up and heard out on the basis of submissions of counsel before this Court and on the basis of the record before this Court.

Captioned matter adjourned with the afore-referred caveat.

List on 20.02.2026.'

[4] To be noted, today also, there is no representation for the respondent either in the physical Court or on the Video Conferencing (V.C.) platform, inter alia in the light of earlier proceedings dated 16.12.2025, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the captioned review petition as withdrawn/closed on the ground that the same has become infructuous, taking note of the endorsement made by learned counsel on record for review petitioner.

[5] Captioned review petition is disposed of as withdrawn/closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Indrajeet