

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 3011/2026 IN SLP(C) NO. 33857/2026

[ARISING OUT OF IMPUGNED FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 24-09-2026
IN SLP(C) NO. NO. 33857/2026 PASSED BY THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA]

M/S NIRBHAY CONSTRUCTION

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MANIPUR & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

FOR ADMISSION

IA NO. 305075/2026 - MODIFICATION

WITH

MA 3012/2026 IN SLP(C) NO. 33857/2026 (XV)

FOR ADMISSION

IA NO. 305076/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

Date : 09-10-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General
Mr. Lenin Singh Hijam, Advocate General
Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar- 1593, AOR
Mr. Karun Shamra, Adv.
Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.
Ms. Rajkumari Divyasana, Adv.
Mr. Digvijay Dam, Adv.

Mr. Paramjit Singh Patwalia, Sr. Adv.
Mr. N Jotendro Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. David Ahongsangbam, Adv.
Mr. Elangbam Premjit Singh, Adv.
Mr. Ashlikumar Athokpam, Adv.
Mr. Raj Singh, Adv.
Ms. Rajkumari Banju- 2224, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Prashant Bhushan, Adv.
Ms. Neha Reethi, Adv.
Ms. Somya Kumari, Adv.
Mr. Anjan Sahu, Adv.
Ms. Kajal Giri, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Yadav, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

We have heard learned Solicitor General appearing for the State of Manipur; learned senior counsel appearing for the fourth respondent; and also learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

By order dated 24.09.2026, we had observed in paragraph 5 as under:

"Till the disposal of the Writ Petition on merits by the learned Single Judge, the respondents shall maintain status quo."

It is submitted by learned Solicitor General appearing for the respondent(s)-State as well as by learned senior counsel appearing for the fourth respondent in the Special Leave Petition(s) that even prior to the date of passing of the order by this Court, on 22.09.2026 and 23.09.2026 work orders had already been issued to the fourth respondent. Therefore, the observation aforesaid at paragraph 5 of the order dated 24.09.2026 creates an uncertainty inasmuch as the direction to maintain *status quo* would imply that despite the work orders being issued to the fourth respondent in the Special Leave Petition(s), they cannot proceed with the work.

In the circumstances, we observe that in view of the work orders being issued, the fourth respondent herein is at liberty to carry on the work in terms of the said work orders subject to result of the Writ Petition filed by the petitioner(s) herein.

The High Court is at liberty to issue consequential directions depending upon the result of the case.

Miscellaneous Applications are accordingly disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(B. LAKSHMI MANIKYA VALLI)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(DIVYA BABBAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)