

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

W.P. (C) No. 600 of 2015

Md Naziruddin Shah, SDC (Retd.), aged about 68 years, a resident of Keikhoo Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.

..... *Petitioner*

- Versus -

1. State of Manipur represented by the Commissioner/Secretary, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms (ARD), Government of Manipur, Imphal-795001.
2. The Commissioner/Secretary, Finance (PIC), Government of Manipur, Imphal-795001.
3. The Commissioner/Secretary (GAD) Government of Manipur, Imphal -795001.
4. The Manipur State Information Commission represented by the Registrar, Manipur Information Commission, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal-795001.
5. The Under Secretary, Manipur Information Commission, Imphal-795001.

.... *Respondents*

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. RAMALINGAM SUDHAKAR

31.05.2019

[1] Heard Mr. N. Surendrajit, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Shyam Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the respondents.

[2] The writ petition has been filed challenging the proceedings (Annexure-A/12) dated 20.06.2015 and clamming salary for the period from 01.04.2013 to 30.09.2013. This order was passed

based on a direction by this Court in W.P. (C) No. 991 of 2014 and the representation before 10.04.2012.

[3] A perusal of the impugned order [Para 2 & 3] makes it clear that the petitioner was engaged as a Deputy Registrar/ Manipur State Information Commission on contract basis on 25.05.2010 which was extended from time to time. The last extension was for the period from 01.04.2012 to 31.03.2013. Thereafter, according to the impugned order no extension was granted.

[4] On the contrary petitioner pleads on the basis of (Annexure-A/16) letter addressed by him to Under Secretary (Revenue/MAHUD) that he has submitted Annual Report on 20.05.2013. He has written a letter on 23.09.2013 to the Under Secretary, Manipur Information Commission that his contract period is expired by 30.09.2013. However, there is no document to show proof of extension upto 23.09.2013. In his letter dated 23.09.2013 petitioner has referred to an official letter dated 26.03.2013 issued by the State Information Commissioner, Manipur. That document, however, is not enclosed with the writ petition. Hence, the claim is disputed.

[5] Be that as it may, it appears that the claim of the petitioner is based on letters but without supporting documents. In such event no relief can be granted except to give liberty to the petitioner to submit the documents to the authority so as to consider such documents and to prove that he was continuing in service till 30.09.2013. If such

documents are filed along with a representation, the same may be considered by authority a fresh. The impugned order is correct in the present facts and hence the relief is declined.

[6] Writ petition stands disposed of as above.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Sapana