

*Sl. Nos. 2, 7 & 9
With
Sl. Nos. 6, 8 & 10*

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

Review. Pet. No. 33 of 2025

State of Manipur and 7 others

Petitioners

Vs.

Pheiroijam Heramani and 16 others

Respondents

Clubbed with Review. Pet. No. 34 of 2025

With Review. Pet. No. 35 of 2025

With

MC(Review. Pet.) No. 27 of 2025

With MC(Review. Pet.) No. 28 of 2025

With MC(Review. Pet.) No. 29 of 2025

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)

15.12.2025

[1] Captioned 3 (three) review petitions have been filed by State seeking review of a 'common order dated 29.08.2025 made in Writ Appeal Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024' ('impugned order' for the sake of convenience). To be noted, the order sought to be reviewed is being referred to as 'impugned order' for the sake of convenience as the order is not assailed by State and State seeks only a review that too a limited review about which there will be allusion infra.

[2] Learned Attorney General for India Mr. R. Venkataramani is before us on the V.C. (Video Conferencing) platform. To be noted, learned State Counsel Mr. O. Ratan Kumar who is in the physical court before us is the counsel on record for the review petitioner and he is instructing learned Attorney General.

[3] Learned Attorney General submits that State is not assailing the impugned order by carrying it to Hon'ble Supreme Court. This submission is recorded.

[4] Learned Attorney General, advertent to paragraph No. 64 of the impugned order submits that 11 (eleven) subparagraphs thereat constitute the operative portion of the order and State in the captioned review petition is seeking review of only 4 (four) out of the 11 (eleven) sub-paragraphs viz., sub-paragraphs (viii) to (xi). Axiomatically, State accepts sub-paragraphs (i) to (vii) and State is giving legal quietus with regard to sub-paragraphs (i) to (vii) is learned Attorney General's further say.

[5] As regards the grounds of review, learned Attorney General fairly submits that the case of State may not fall within the first two categories viz., a) discovery of new/important matter and b) mistake/error on the face of record and it is further submitted that it would only fall within the third ground of any other sufficient reason which necessarily has to be read in the context of the first two grounds. It is submitted that the prevailing local scenario is new/important matter

discovery of which was not possible at the time the impugned order was made and that has necessitated the captioned review. Elaborating on this, it is submitted that State is under President's Rule and therefore, conduct of fresh elections within 6 (six) months at this juncture is not desirable and it may not be desirable to conduct fresh elections after a popular Government is put in place or after the elapsing of the President's Rule which will be sometime in February, 2026.

[6] It is also submitted that with regard to 6 (six) months time frame qua appointment of Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayat Administrators, the feasibility of appointing new Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayat Administrators is being examined and the State will be able to revert to this Court on the same in January when the Court reopens after winter vacation.

[7] In the light of submissions of learned Attorney General, considering that State accepts the impugned order with the exception of the 4 (four) sub-paragraphs in the operative portion, this Court deems it appropriate to write that a prima facie case for issue of notice has been made out in the captioned review petitions.

[8] It is deemed appropriate to write that the 4 Clauses (4 subparagraphs in paragraph 64 which is operative portion of impugned order) pertain to appointment of Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayats Administrators made either pursuant to the interim orders or in any other manner being set aside, State Government being directed

to conduct the elections (local body elections) within a time frame of 6 (six) months and a further directive which says that State Government is at liberty to appoint fresh Administrative Committees and Gram Panchayats till the election is conducted albeit within 6 (six) months. For the sake of convenience, we deem it appropriate to extract and reproduce the 4(four) sub-paragraphs qua which review is sought the same read as follows :

‘(viii) All orders of appointment of the Administrative Committee of the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad, issued by State Govt. in pursuance of the interim order dated 29.02.2024 for a term exceeding the period of 6 (six) months and till the election are held, are all set aside.

(ix) All other orders of appointment of the Administrative Committee of the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad, issued by State Govt. for a term exceeding the period of 6 (six) months and till the election are held, are also all set aside.

(x) The State Govt. is directed to conduct fresh election within a period of 6 months.

(xi) Till the next election is conducted as directed in para (x) above, the State Govt. is at liberty to appoint fresh Administrative Committee for the Gram Panchayat and Administrator for Zilla Parishad in terms of the provisions of Section 22, Section 92 and Section 109 of the Manipur Panchayati Raj, Act 1994 for a period not exceeding 6 months.’

[9] Issue notice to respondents in all 3 (three) captioned review petitions and all the 3 (three) captioned MCs thereat.

[10] Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel who is present in court accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 in Review. Petition No. 33 of 2025. Ms. L. Ayangleima, learned counsel who is present in court accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Petition No. 33 of 2025 and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel who is present in court accepts notice for Respondent No. 12 in Review. Petition No. 34 of 2025. As regards the other respondents and respondents in Review Petition No. 35 of 2025, issue notice returnable by 12.01.2026. Dasti service is also permitted.

[11] Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior advocate appearing on behalf of Mr. A. Arunkumar who has accepted notice for Respondent Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 in Review. Petition No. 33 of 2025 submits on instructions that contempt petition being Cont. Case(C) No. 140 of 2025 (already filed) will not be pursued and same can be kept in abeyance until the captioned review petitions are decided one way or the other. This submission made by learned senior advocate, on instructions, at the Bar is recorded.

[12] List on 12.01.2026.

Sushil

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE