

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

MC (Review. Pet.) No. 2 of 2026

State of Manipur; & Ors.

Applicants

Vs.

Pheiroijam Heramani; & Ors.

Respondents

With

***MC (Review. Pet.) No. 27 of 2025 with
MC (Review. Pet.) No. 28 of 2025 with
MC (Review. Pet.) No. 29 of 2025 with
MC (Review. Pet.) No. 3 of 2026 with
Review. Pet. No. 33 of 2025 with
Review. Pet. No. 34 of 2025 with
Review. Pet. No. 35 of 2025 with
Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025 with
Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025 with
Review. Pet. No. 39 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 Mr. M. Sundar, CJ)

13.03.2026

[1] Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listings, more particularly the proceedings made in the previous listing on 25.02.2026 which reads as follows:

'25.02.2026

[1] Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings more particularly, the proceedings dated 23.01.2026.

[2] In the hearing today, learned Attorney General for India Shri R. Venkataramani was before this Court on the Video Conferencing (VC) platform and he is instructed by learned State Counsel Mr. O. Ratan Kumar who is before us in the physical Court. Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior advocate

instructed by Mr. A. Arunkumar, Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba and Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 9 to 15 in Review Petn. No.38 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Petn. No.33 of 2025 and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) are before this Court.

[3] After some arguments, it was submitted by all counsel that the earlier pre-hearing conference held on 24.01.2026 in Imphal remains inconclusive and that it is desirable to try and conclude the same.

[4] Learned Attorney General for India, all the afore-referred learned senior counsel, counsel, agreed to have another pre-hearing conference in the ensuing Yaoshang holidays so as to come up with possible suggestions. Though obvious, we make it clear that the court will ultimately take a call qua any suggestion.

[5] In the interregnum, as regards State Election Commission, (in the light of sub-paragraph (x) of paragraph 64 of the order sought to be reviewed) shall place before this Court a timetable for conducting the elections to the local bodies (Gram Panchayats and Zilla Parishads) in the next listing. It is made clear that the timetable shall give firm dates for various stages of the election process i.e., from Notification, polling declaration of results, etc..

[6] All the learned senior counsel and counsel very fairly submitted that they would coordinate with the office of the learned Attorney General regarding logistics of the meeting (pre-hearing conference) and this Court is informed by learned Attorney General that Advocate General for State of Manipur would also participate in the meeting as in the previous meeting on 24.01.2026.

[7] Mr. Biswajit, learned senior counsel, on instructions, submitted that he will place before this Court

details of payments that have to be made to contractors for work that has been done hitherto.

[8] Let the matter stand over to 13.03.2026.

[9] List on 13.03.2026.'

[2] In the hearing today, Mr. R. Venkatarami, learned Attorney General for India instructed by Mr. Kartikay Agrawal, learned counsel is before this Court on the Video Conferencing (VC) platform, Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General instructed by Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. A. Arukumar, learned counsel, Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior counsel instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba and Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 9 to 15 in Review Petn. No.38 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 11 to 17 in Review. Petn. No.33 of 2025 and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) are before this Court.

[3] Adverting to paragraph 4 of the earlier proceedings, learned Attorney General for India and senior counsel/counsel before this Court, submitted that a pre-hearing conference was held in New Delhi on 09.03.2026 (Monday). It was submitted that a further meeting here in Manipur with learned Advocate General and other senior counsel/counsel, in continuation of earlier meeting is necessary.

[4] After the meeting, if the afore-referred learned senior counsel and counsel come up with suggestions/proposals, it is made clear that the same will be considered by this Court, taking into account larger public

interest *i.e.*, it would be considered without restricting it or limiting it to the
lis alone.

[5] Adverting to paragraph 5 of our earlier proceedings, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel for State Election Commission (State of Manipur) submitted that the office of State Election Commissioner is lying vacant. This Court finds that State Election Commission has to be constituted by the Government. This is *vide* Section 98 of 'the Manipur Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (26 of 1994)' (hereinafter 'said Act' for the sake of brevity), 'Government' is defined *vide* Section 2(g) of said Act and it is 'State Government of Manipur'. Learned Attorney General and Learned Advocate General fairly submitted that they will play necessary advisory roles *qua* appointment of State Election Commissioner.

[6] In the light of the narrative thus far, let this matter stand over to 02.04.2026. To be noted, 02.04.2026 is a date agreed by senior counsel and counsel before this Court and all counsel requested for listing on 02.04.2026.

[7] List on 02.04.2026.

Sandeep

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE