

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

WP(C)No.824 of 2022

Shri Chintu Wahengbam, aged about 30 years, s/o W. Sailesh Kumar
Singh, Nongmeibung Chakpram Leirak, PO & PS Porompat, Imphal
East District, Manipur.

...Petitioner

- Versus -

The State of represented by the Principal Secretary (Home)
Government of Manipur, office at Old Secretariat Babupara, PO & PS
Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001 & Anr.

...Respondents

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MV MURALIDARAN

ORDER

29.09.2022

[1] Heard Mr. TH. Khagemba, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. S. Niranjana, learned GA for the State respondents.

[2] Mr. S. Niranjana, learned Government Advocate for the
respondents takes notice and hence no formal notice is required.

[3] Since both the counsels of the writ petition at the motion
stage itself.

[4] Mr. TH. Khagemba, learned counsel for the petitioner represented that the petitioner has filed the present writ petition seeking the prayers as follows:

(i) to admit the present writ petition

(ii) to issue rule nisi calling upon the respondents to show cause as to why prayer made by the petitioner shall not be granted in the facts and circumstances of the present petition.

(iii) to issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus/Certiorari or any other appropriate writ/directions/orders, directing the respondents to consider and dispose of the detailed representation dated 01.08.2022(at Annexure-A/10) submitted by the petitioner within stipulated period of time, by issuing reasoned and speaking order expeditiously, in view of the facts and circumstances of the present writ petition.

(iv) if no cause is shown or insufficient cause is shown, make the rule absolute.

(v) to call for the entire relevant records.

(vi) to pass any order/writ/directions which the Hon'ble Court deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

[5] Mr. TH. Khagemba, learned counsel for the petitioner represented that that the petitioner filed this writ petition and prayed this Court only to issue direction to the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 01.08.2022 and to pass appropriate speaking order within a stipulated period of time. Therefore, if this

Court incline to consider and issue direction to the respondents to pass order on the petitioner's representation, no prejudice would be caused to the respondents. Hence, he prayed for disposal of the writ petition.

[6] Mr. S. Niranjana, learned GA for the State respondents who takes notice on behalf of the respondents represented that though the petitioner sought for only simple prayer for disposal of the writ petition with a direction to the respondents to pass order on his representation dated 01.08.2022 and to pass orders, but the petitioner has given the representation only on 01.08.2022, he may be given time to get about the status of the representation and report this Court. Therefore, he prayed this Court for time.

[7] Mr. S. Niranjana, learned GA further represented that in spite of giving time to the respondents, if this Court inclined to issue direction for consideration of the petitioner's representation, he may be given some breathing time to pass appropriate orders.

[8] Considering the arguments advanced by both the counsels, without going into the merits of the case, this Court inclined to grant the relief as sought for by the petitioner since it is only a mandamus directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 01.08.2022 and to pass appropriate speaking order.

[9] In the result,

(a) this writ petition is disposed of.

(b) the respondents are directed to pass appropriate speaking order on the petitioner's representation date 01.08.2022.

(c) the said exercise shall be done within a period of 8(eight) weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

[9] With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of.

JUDGE

John kom