

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

MC(WA) No. 101 of 2025

State of Manipur and another

Applicants

Vs.

Manipur Olympic Association and 2 others

Respondents

BEFORE

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

ORDER

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

23.01.2026

[1] Captioned Misc. case (MC) has been filed with a prayer seeking condonation of delay (CoD).

[2] This order has to be read in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listing on 15.12.2025 which reads as follows :

'15.12.2025

[1] Captioned MC has been filed with a prayer seeking condonation of delay (CoD) qua 47 (forty seven) days delay in filing a writ appeal, assailing an order dated 08.07.2025 made in WP(C) No. 68 of 2024 ('impugned judgment and order' for the sake of clarity).

[2] Ms. Nikita Mangsatabam, learned State Counsel, adverting to paragraph 4, submits that the delay was neither

willful nor deliberate but owing to time consumed in various procedures in the State machinery.

[3] Issue notice.

[4] Mr. Leo N., learned counsel, accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2. As regards, Respondent No. 3, notice returnable by 12.01.2026. Dasti notice is also permitted. Learned State Counsel is also permitted to serve on the learned counsel who appeared for Respondent No. 3 before the Hon'ble Single Bench.

[5] List on 12.01.2026.'

[3] Today, Ms. Nikita Mangsatabam, learned State Counsel for appellants and Mr. Leo N, learned counsel for R1 and R2 are before this Court. R3 has since been duly served and Mr. Syed Murtaza Ahmed, learned counsel, has entered appearance on behalf of R3 and he is before this Court.

[4] Learned State Counsel Ms. Nikita Mangsatabam, adverting to the CoD petition, more particularly, paragraph 7 thereat which contains a tabulation, submits that delay occurred owing to the time consumed in State taking a decision regarding preferring appeal and various tiers which the matter had to pass through.

[5] Though no affidavit-in-opposition has been filed, all the respondents agreed to have the MC heard out.

[6] Mr. Leo opposed the plea of the State by pointing out that this is what has been described by courts repeatedly as file pushing and therefore, the same should not be countenanced.

[7] Mr. Syed Murtaza Ahmed very fairly submitted that he is not opposing the CoD prayer.

[8] This Court carefully considered the matter.

[9] In the light of the facts and circumstances of the case, the trajectory the matter has taken thus far and more particularly, the manner in which the litigants are circumstanced, this Court is of the considered view that this is a fit case to accede to the CoD prayer though the State could have been a little more diligent.

[10] Ergo, the sequitur is, delay is condoned and captioned MC is ordered as prayed for.

[11] There shall be no order as to costs.

[12] Registry to process the appeal and assign a number if the main appeal is otherwise in order.

Sushil

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE