

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

**WP(C) No. 1013 of 2025 with
MC(WP(C) No. 929 of 2025**

Ningthoujam Minerva Devi

.....*Petitioner/s*

- Versus -

State of Manipur & 2 Ors.

.... *Respondent/s*

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA

Order

19.12.2025

[1] Heard Mr. N. Mahendra, learned counsel appearing along with Mr. S. Samungou, learned counsel for the petitioner.

[2] The petitioner is aggrieved by the notice dated 05.12.2025 issued by the Sub-Deputy Collector, Imphal West (Central)-I directing him to remove/vacate any wrongful possession of land not appertaining his holding otherwise it will be removed by 15.12.2025 failing which eviction proceedings shall be forcefully executed on 20.12.2025 at 09:30 a.m.

[3] It is the case of the petitioner that the impugned notice amounts to judicial proceeding and SDC has no jurisdiction under Manipur Land Revenue and Land Reforms Act, 1960 to conduct eviction proceeding.

[4] On the other hand, Mr. S. Niranjana, learned G.A., has pointed out that the impugned notice dated 05.12.2025 is issued in pursuance of the order dated 27.09.2013 passed by the SDC, Imphal West (Central) directing the petitioner to remove brick wall encroaching upon the nullah and this order has already been passed by DC, Imphal West in Revenue (Eviction) Case No. 1 of 2021 and the same attains finality, as this orders

are not interfered by revenue tribunal vide order dated 13.06.2025 in Revenue Revision Case No. 7 of 2024.

[5] Learned G.A. submits that the impugned notice cannot be considered as an eviction proceeding but is in compliance of revenue tribunal's orders which attains finality.

[6] Mr. N. Mahendra, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the order dated 27.09.2013 passed by the SDC, Imphal West (Central) is without any jurisdiction and is void ab initio and as per the decision of the Honb'le Supreme Court reported as (2001) 6 SCC 534 para 22, such orders are not required to be challenged.

[7] Issue notice.

[8] Mr. S. Niranjan, learned G.A. accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 & 2.

[9] Petitioner is directed to take step to respondent No. 3 by speed post within one week and file affidavit of proof of service.

[10] Mr. N. Mahendra, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that status quo as on date may be maintained as the cause of the writ petition will become infructuous if the petitioner is evicted during the pendency of the same.

[11] Considering this, status quo as on date be maintained till the next date.

[12] List this case on 30.01.2026.

JUDGE

Kh. Joshua Maring