

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

MC(Review.Pet.) No. 20 of 2023

Ref:- WP(C) No. 71 of 2017

State of Manipur and another

Applicants

Vs.

Ksh. Bijoy Singh

Respondent

BEFORE

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. KEMPAIAH SOMASHEKAR

ORDER

31.07.2025

[1] Heard Mr. Athouba Khaidem, learned senior counsel for the applicants and Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel for the respondent.

[2] In this application, the applicants are seeking for condoning the delay of 1598 days.

[3] This application has appended with an affidavit for seeking consideration of the reasons stated therein for condonation of considerable period which is stated in this application proceeding.

[4] On the contrary, learned senior counsel Mr. N. Jotendro for the respondents is present and wherein the said senior counsel has referred the affidavit-in-opposition filed on behalf of the respondent in response to the miscellaneous case which has been filed by the applicants/petitioners in his response to this application wherein in para

No. 4 it reveals as before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for review of the judgment passed on 17.08.2018 in connection with S.P. (C) No. 22172 of 2018 filed by the State but the Review Petition being Review Petition (C) No. 34906 of 2022 has been dismissed on the ground of inordinate delay of 1505 days. It is further submitted that the Review Petition filed by the State of Manipur was dismissed on the ground of inordinate delay as well as on merit. Therefore, in the instant review petition, there is no considerable delay while filing the instant review petition and there is no justifiable explanation made therein for consideration and on this premises only, the learned senior counsel for the respondent is seeking for dismissal of this application filed by the State of Manipur for seeking condonation of delay of 1598 days.

[5] However, keeping in view the submission made by the learned senior counsel for the respondent and even dwelling in detail about the reasons stated in this application, it is deemed it appropriate to state that the application for seeking condonation of delay does not have any substance and also there is no justifiable explanation made for acceptance.

[6] Consequently, the proceeding in MC(Review.Pet.) No. 20 of 2023 is hereby dismissed.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Sushil