

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

MC(PIL) No. 8 of 2026

1. The Commissioner / Secretary Water Resource, Government of Manipur, Old Secretariat Building, Babupara, PO & PS Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
2. The State of Manipur represented by the Chief Secretary, Government of Manipur, Old Secretariat Building, Babupara, PO & PS Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Chief Engineer, Water Resource Department, Government of Manipur, PWD Complex, Khuyathong, PO & PS Imphal, Manipur – 795001.

... Applicants

- Versus -

1. Keisham Meghachandra Singh, MLA (Member of Legislative Assembly) of Wangkhem Assembly Constituency in Manipur Legislative Assembly, aged about 52 years old S/o (Late) Keisham Meghachandra Singh, Yairipok Bishnunaha, Yairipok, P.O. Yairipok, P.S. Yairipok, Thoubal District, Manipur – 795149.

... Respondent

2. The Union of Ministry of Jal Shakti, represented by the Secretary, Department of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation, Government of India, CR Section, Room No. 224, Shram Shakti Bhawan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi – 110001.
3. The Secretary to the Hon'ble Governor of Manipur, Raj Bhavan, Manipur, Imphal P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Manipur – 795001.

... Proforma Respondents

B E F O R E

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

For the applicant : Mr. Lenin Hijam, Advocate General, Manipur
instructed by Ms. Thanyomi Keishing,
Advocate

For the respondents : Mr. N. Bupenda, Advocate for R – 1

Date of hearing : 20.03.2026

Date of judgment & order: **20.03.2026**

JUDGMENT & ORDER
(ORAL)

[M. Sundar, CJ]

[1] Public Interest Litigation (PIL) being PIL No. 29 of 2025 was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 17.11.2025 which reads as follows:

Order dated 17.11.2025 -

[1] Captioned 'Public Interest Litigation' ('PIL' for the sake of brevity) has been filed by a sitting member of the Manipur Legislative Assembly (MLA, for the sake of brevity) representing Wangkhem Constituency Assembly.

[2] Mr. N. Bupenda Meitei, learned counsel for PIL petitioner submits that subject matter of captioned PIL is 'Mapithel Dam which is also known as Thoubal Multipurpose Project' situate in Thoubal district ('said Dam' and the opening of the said Dam on 14.09.2025 night/early hours of 15.09.2025).

[3] Mr. N. Bupenda, Meitei, learned counsel for PIL petitioner, adverting to the case file and the annexures thereat submits that the afore-referred opening of the said Dam was without prior information to the local populace/citizenry living downstream. Learned counsel submits that there is no information through media such as television, radio, newspaper or other social media prior to opening of the said Dam on the aforesaid date and that resulted in inundation and loss of several acres of agricultural paddy fields, fish

farms and human lives besides inundation of thousands of houses and loss of property.

[4] *Learned counsel for PIL petitioner, Mr. N. Bupenda Meitei contends that the aforesaid scenario was avoidable and the loss/damage could have been minimized or alleviated if there was prior intimation. Learned counsel also submits that there are differing statements regarding the quantum of rainfall qua official statements.*

[5] *Issue notice to respondent Nos. 1, 3,4 & 5.*

[6] *Ms. Thanyonmi Keishing, learned counsel accepts notice for respondent Nos. 1, 3 & 4 and Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General(AG) appears on her behalf. Mr. Themchuiyo Kashung, learned counsel representing Mr. S. Vijayanand Sharma, learned counsel accepts notice for respondent No.5.*

[7] *Learned AG, Mr. Lenin Hijam submits that the allegation qua officials is not correct but in any event without taking an adversarial position considering that this is a human problem a Committee headed by Chief Secretary, Manipur along with a member from R5 shall be constituted, the Committee would go into to the matter and submit a report.*

[8] *In the light of what has unfurled thus far, with the consent of learned counsel for writ petitioner, Mr. N. Bupenda Meitei, learned AG for respondent Nos.1,3 & 4 and Mr. Themchuiyo Kashung, learned counsel for Respondent No.5 i.e., with the consent of all the counsel, the main appeal was taken up in the admission board itself. To be noted, Respondent Nos. 1,3 4 & 5 consented to this course without insisting on filing counter affidavit as stated position of the State that this may not be viewed as adversarial litigation.*

[9] *To be noted, as would be evident from the narrative thus far, this court has restrained itself from issuing notice to respondent No.2 in the instant matter. However, the main PIL petition was taken up with consent of both sides (without notice to R2 and leaving this question open).*

[10] *This court having taken up the main appeal in the aforesaid manner, carefully considered the case file, annexures and submissions of the learned counsel before this court. It comes to the light that PIL petitioner has sent two representations, one dated 04.10.2025 and another dated 16.10.2025 which have been placed before this Court as annexures A/28 and A/29 respectively. These representations have been duly received by the addressees and there is no disputation that reply has not been sent to the PIL Petitioner. To be noted, this has necessitated the PIL.*

[11] *Be that as it may, it could be appropriate to write that a Committee as proposed by learned AG can be constituted, the Committee can go into the issue including the afore-referred representations of PIL petitioner, draw up a report and R1 shall send a suitable response to the PIL petitioner i.e., response to 2(two) representations. Learned AG submits that this exercise shall be completed within 12(twelve) weeks from today i.e., on or before 02.03.2026. This also means that the response to PIL petitioner's afore-referred representations will be furnished to the PIL petitioner (under due acknowledgement) on or before 02.02.2026.*

[12] *In the light of the fair stand taken by both sides, the captioned PIL is given a closure but making it clear that all the rights and contentions of the PIL petitioner, any other person concerned for this matter, R1, 3,4 and 5 stand preserved post response of R1 in afore-referred manner. We deem it appropriate to add that we have not expressed any view or opinion on the merits of the matter in this order and we leave open all questions. We also make it clear that if the PIL petitioner or any other person concerned for this matter, if not satisfied with the response of the State can assail the same in a manner known to law if such scenario unfurls. The same will be considered on its own merits and in accordance with law untrammelled by instant order.*

[13] *Caption PIL disposed of in the aforesaid manner albeit with afore-mentioned observations and preservation of rights and contentions in the aforesaid manner.*

[14] *There shall be no order as to costs.'*

As a minor inadvertent typographical error had crept in, qua paragraph No. 11 of aforementioned 17.11.2025 order, MC(PIL) No. 38 of 2025 was taken out and the same came to be disposed of by an order dated 25.11.2025 which reads as follows:

Order dated 25.11.2025 -

[1] *Captioned main PIL i.e. PIL No.29 of 2025 was disposed of by this Court in and by an 'order dated 17.11.2025'('said order' for the sake of convenience).*

[2] *In the said order, a time frame for a Committee (to be constituted) to draw up a report and for R1 to send a suitable response to PIL petitioner was fixed. The time frame is 12(twelve) weeks i.e. on or before 02.03.2026. While in the first part of paragraph 11 of said order, the date has been correctly typed as '02.03.2026' in the last sentence of the same paragraph 11 of*

said order, the date has been erroneously typed as '02.02.2026'. This is an inadvertent typographical error(to be noted, this has necessitated the captioned MC).

[3] *Today, H. Debendra, learned Deputy Advocate General instructed by Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned counsel for petitioners(MC); Mr. Mr. S. Vijayanand Sharma, learned counsel for respondent No. 2 and Mr. N. Bupenda, learned counsel for respondent No.1 are before us in the physical Court. Both sides very fairly agreed that the date in the last sentence (also last line) of paragraph 11 of said order should read as '02.03.2026', this correction is now effected vide instant order, by consent of both sides.*

[4] *This order, on being uploaded will serve as an addenda to said order and it will also serve as errata/corrigendum qua said order dated 17.11.2025.*

[5] *Captioned MC disposed of in the aforesaid manner vide instant consent order. There shall be no order as to costs.'*

[2] The afore-referred two orders have to be read together. This means that response to PIL petitioner's representations should be furnished to PIL petitioner (under due acknowledgement) on or before 02.03.2026. Expressing some difficulties regarding meeting this timeline, captioned MC has been taken out by State seeking further time (8 weeks) to complete the exercise.

[3] In the hearing today, learned Advocate General of Manipur and senior advocate, Mr. Lenin Hijam instructed by Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel is before this Court. Learned Advocate General, advertng to the MC(PIL) No. 8 of 2026 more particularly paragraph Nos. 4 & 8 thereat submits that the Union Ministry of Jal Shakti, Government of India had to nominate a member in the committee who is to go into the PIL petitioner's representations, that has since been done after which a meeting

was held on 27.02.2026, all this consumed time and that has necessitated the captioned MC (PIL) No. 8 of 2026.

[4] Issue notice to 'respondent No. 1' alone ('R-1' for the sake of brevity and convenience) (to be noted, R - 1 is PIL petitioner).

[5] Mr. N. Bupenda, learned counsel for PIL petitioner is before this Court and learned counsel accepts notice for R-1. Learned counsel points out that constitution of committee was contemplated even as of 17.11.2025.

[6] Nonetheless as it is not an adversarial litigation in every sense of the expression and the PIL petitioner is more in the nature of an informant, we deem it appropriate to grant further time to State (as sought for before this Court) and it is also appropriate to write that in support of captioned MC(PIL No. 8 of 2026), State has placed before us proceedings of a meeting chaired by Chief Secretary, Government of Manipur held on 27.02.2026 and vide sub-paragraph No. iv of paragraph No. 4 of this proceedings, it has been mentioned that a report is to be submitted to the High Court of Manipur. For the sake of specificity, we clarify that in the orders disposing of the PIL, this Court has not requisitioned any report. It has only directed State to furnish its response (response to PIL petitioner's representations) to PIL petitioner (under due acknowledgement) on or before 02.03.2026. This is abundantly clear from paragraph No. 11 of our order dated 17.11.2025 which now is to be read together with order dated 25.11.2025.

[7] The timeline of 02.03.2026 is extended up to 11.05.2026. This means that the orders in PIL (PIL No. 29 of 2025) dated 17.11.2025 and 25.11.2025 [MC(PIL) No. 38 of 2025] will remain the same in all other aspects except that the date in paragraph No. 11 of order dated 17.11.2025 (as corrected vide order dated 25.11.2025) will now read as 11.05.2026 instead of 02.03.2026.

[8] Captioned MC(PIL) No. 8 of 2026 disposed of in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

FR/NFR

Bipin

P.S. I : Upload forthwith.

P.S. II : All concerned will stand bound by web copy uploaded in High Court website inter alia as the same is QR coded.