

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

PIL No. 69 of 2021

Yumnam Dijendro Meitei, aged about 52 years, S/o Late Y. Ibochouba Singh, resident of Mayang Imphal Thana Maning Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal and District Imphal West, Manipur – 795132.

... Petitioner

- Versus -

1. State of Manipur through the Chief Secretary, Government of Manipur, Imphal, Old Secretariat -795001.
2. The Principal Secretary/Commissioner/Secretary, State Council for Education & Training, Government of Manipur, Old Secretariat Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Director, State Council for Education & Training, Government of Manipur, at Lamphelpat – 795004.
4. The Chief Engineer, Education Engineering Wing, Government of Manipur, DM College Campus, Imphal West, Manipur – 795001.

... Respondents

B E F O R E

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. BIMOL SINGH**

For the petitioner	:	Mr. Sh. Athoi, Advocate along with Ms. Jotibala, Advocate
For the respondents	:	Mr. S. Nepolean, Senior Advocate instructed by Mr. Y. Robert, Deputy Government Advocate
Date of hearing	:	16.03.2026
Date of judgment & order	:	16.03.2026

JUDGMENT & ORDER
(ORAL)


[M. Sundar, CJ]

[1] Captioned 'Public Interest Litigation' ('PIL' for the sake of brevity) turns on a short point. The central theme of the captioned PIL is shifting of 'District Institute of Education and Training Centre' ('DIET Centre' for the sake of convenience and brevity).

[2] In the hearing today, Mr. Sh. Athoi, learned counsel along with Ms. Jotibala, learned counsel for PIL petitioner and Y. Robert, learned Deputy Government Advocate (State counsel) led by Mr. S. Nepolean, learned senior advocate for all four respondents are before this Court.

[3] Short facts shorn of particulars not imperative for appreciating instant order are that DIET Centre is now located within DM College campus in Imphal West; that sometime in 2016, the plan to upgrade DM College and make it a Deemed University was in the anvil owing to which a policy decision was taken that the entire land i.e. entire campus on which DM College is now situate is required for the Deemed University; that owing to such requirement, a further decision was taken to shift DIET Centre from DM College campus; that Mayang Imphal, Imphal West District was proposed and this Court is informed that foundation stone was laid in Mayang Imphal, Imphal West District, but admittedly no construction has been put up i.e. not even a brick has been laid; that under such circumstances, a further policy decision was taken by the State to shift DIET Centre to Salam Mamang Leikai, Imphal West to land measuring about 4.95

acre under C.S. Dag Chitha No. 182 (New) in village No. 76 of Salam Keikhu; that it is seen from case file that this land has been classified as Sarkari Sanjabung ; that this location shall be referred to 'Lamsang' for the sake of clarity; that after various proceedings an order dated 22.05.2021 bearing reference No. 13/1/2007-SE/SCERT(Pt-11) was made by the Government of Manipur more particularly SCERT (State Council of Education Research and Training) and scanned reproduction of this order is as follows:



[4] Adverting to the afore-referred proceedings, Mr. Sh. Athoi, learned counsel for PIL petitioner submitted that shifting of DIET Centre to

Lamsang would mean that DIET Centre will now not be situate in '23-Mayang Imphal Assembly Constituency' ('said Assembly Constituency' for the sake of convenience); that the captioned PIL has been filed before this Court on 03.12.2021 but there has been no interim order; that the construction of DIET Centre in Lamsang had commenced and it is at a very advanced stage now.

[5] The lone grievance of the PIL petitioner is that shifting DIET Centre from DM College campus, Imphal West to Lamsang will mean that DIET Centre will now not be situate in the said Assembly Constituency.


[6] In response to the above submission, learned senior counsel appearing for 'all respondents' ('State' collectively) submitted that Lamsang is a more convenient location qua Mayang Imphal as it has a better approach qua students and therefore, the same was chosen. Learned State counsel drew our attention to affidavit-in-opposition of R-4 (The Chief Engineer, Education Engineering Wing, Government of Manipur, DM College Campus, Imphal West, Manipur - 795001) dated 03.02.2022 and drew our attention to a positive averment/assertion thereat that distance from Imphal to Lamsang (described as 'Salam' is about 9 Km) it is easily motorable and it has easy access from Imphal, Jiribam National Highway (NH-37) and Imphal – Kangchup Road. Learned State counsel pointed out that this assertion in affidavit-in-opposition of R-4 has not been subjected to disputation or contestation in reply affidavit.

[7] The main PIL was taken up with the consent of learned counsel on both sides and heard out. As already alluded to supra, lone

grievance of the PIL petitioner is shifting DIET Centre to Lamsang instead of originally proposed Mayang Imphal would mean the DIET Centre will now not be situate in said Assembly Constituency.

[8] A careful perusal of the afore-referred proceedings of State dated 22.05.2021 makes it clear that the proposal to shift DIET Centre to Mayang Imphal which is also in Imphal West District was one which was revisited for shifting DIET Centre to more convenient location. It has been categorically averred in 22.05.2021 proceedings that Mayang Imphal location is not suitable for transportation of students and another proposal to shift DIET Centre to Canchipur was also not be implemented owing to non-availability of required land area there.

[9] Learned State counsel, drew our attention to certain photographs which according to learned State counsel were taken in July of 2025 and learned senior counsel for State submits on instructions that construction is at a very advanced stage and almost complete i.e. construction in Lamsang. Scanned reproduction of the photographs are as follows:



[10] This Court carefully considered the submissions made on both sides and this Court comes to the conclusion that prayer in the captioned PIL does not deserve to be acceded to (prayer to direct State to shift DIET Centre to Mayang Imphal as originally proposed instead of Lamsang) and the reasons are as follows:

(i) Lamsang has been chosen after taking into account various determinants, including motorable roads, students comforts etc. that too after considering one more proposal qua Canchipur but on the side of PIL petitioner there is no material to demonstrate that Lamsang is not desirable for DIET Centre to be situate and there is no material to show any inconvenience that is likely to be caused. To be noted, as already alluded to supra, the only grievance of PIL petitioner is that the DIET Centre will not be situate in said Assembly Constituency now;

(ii) Learned counsel for PIL petitioner very fairly submitted that the PIL petitioner is not opposing shifting DIET Centre out of the DM College campus as DM College is to be upgraded as a Deemed University but his complaint is limited to shifting it to Lamsang;

(iii) Learned counsel for PIL petitioner also in the course of hearing admitted that PIL petitioner owns homestead land in Mayang Imphal, Imphal West District which is about 2 Kms. from the site originally proposed for construction of DIET Centre. This Court deems it appropriate to not to delve more qua this aspect and deems it appropriate to leave it at that;

(iv) As already alluded to supra, no public money has been spent for putting up any construction in Mayang Imphal, Imphal West District. There is no disputation and contestation about this aspect. On the contrary, construction is almost complete in Lamsang and there is no material before this Court to show that Lamsang is not suited for having DIET Centre;

(v) Positive averment of R-4 in the affidavit-in-opposition about the distance of Lamsang and Mayang Imphal qua Imphal has not been subjected to disputation with specificity in reply affidavit;

(vi) The question as to whether an institute like DIET Centre or other public offices should be situate is usually in the realm of decision of executive arm in a welfare State and interference of Courts that too

in a PIL petition is an exception when there are compelling reasons to do so;

(vii) If any direction is given at this stage, a huge construction put up in Lamsang with public money which we are informed is almost complete will definitely be put to peril;

(viii) Learned senior counsel for State pressed into service a case law of Hon'ble Supreme Court made in ***Aleemuddin vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors.*** reported in ***AIR 2019 SC 276*** for the proposition that where public buildings (Tehsil building in ***Aleemuddin*** case) are to be constructed is in the realm of administrative matters. In ***Aleemuddin*** case, a PIL was filed seeking a direction to State to construct Tehsil building in village *Karanpur Mafi District Amroha*, this prayer was answered in the affirmative by Hon'ble Division Bench of Allahabad High Court but thereafter a decision was taken to reconstruct the Tehsil in the same place where it exists. Therefore, the direction was sought to be recalled but that was negated and matter was carried to Hon'ble Supreme Court. It is in this context, Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Aleemuddin*** case held that cases in this nature (where Tehsil

building should be constructed) is not a matter for High Court to determine in the exercise of power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India as it is essentially in the realm of administrative matter and decision taken by the executive but in the factual matrix of ***Aleemuddin*** case where, it came to light that the PIL petitioner's family owns land in *Karanpur* village and a similar scenario emerges in the case at hand about which there is allusion elsewhere supra in this order.

[11] In the light of the narrative, discussion and dispositive reasoning thus far, as the lone contention of PIL petitioner is that DIET Centre should not be moved out of the said Assembly Constituency, we have no hesitation in writing that PIL petition fails.

[12] Ergo, sequitur is, captioned PIL is dismissed. This Court refrains itself from imposing costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

FR/NFR

Bipin

P.S. I : Upload forthwith.

P.S. II : All concerned will stand bound by web copy uploaded in High Court website inter alia as the same is QR coded.