

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

**W.A. No. 2 of 2026**

1. State of Manipur, represented by the Commissioner (Co-operation), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat Building, North Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

2. The Registrar of Societies, Manipur having its office at Lamphelpat, P.O. & P.S. Lamphel, District : Imphal West, Lamphelpat, Manipur – 795001.

*... Appellants*

*- Versus -*

1. Manipur Olympic Association, a Registered Association being No. 2740 of 1979, affiliated to the Indian Khuman Lampak Sports Complex, Imphal, through its Secretary General, Longjam Jayantakumar Singh, aged about 61 years, S/o (Late) Longjam Tombichou Singh, a resident of Tera Loukrampam Leikai Awang, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

2. Sunil Elangbam, President, Manipur Olympic Association, aged about 65 years, S/o (Late) Elangbam Deben Singh, a resident of Keishamthong Elangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

*... Principal Respondents*

3. Shri Soibam Indrakumar, aged about 65 years, S/o Soibam Rajmani, a resident of Sagolband Tera Lukhram Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

*... Proforma Respondent*

**With  
MC(WA) No. 3 of 2026**

1. State of Manipur, represented by the Commissioner (Co-operation), Government of Manipur, New Secretariat Building, North Block, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

2. The Registrar of Societies, Manipur having its office at Lamphelpat, P.O. & P.S. Lamphel, District : Imphal West, Lamphelpat, Manipur – 795001.

*... Applicants/Appellants*

*- Versus -*

1. Manipur Olympic Association, a Registered Association being No. 2740 of 1979, affiliated to the Indian Khuman Lampak Sports Complex, Imphal, through its Secretary General, Longjam Jayantakumar Singh, aged about 61 years, S/o (Late) Longjam Tombichou Singh, a resident of Tera Loukrampam Leikai Awang, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

2. Sunil Elangbam, President, Manipur Olympic Association, aged about 65 years, S/o (Late) Elangbam Deben Singh, a resident of Keishamthong Elangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

*... Principal Respondents*

3. Shri Soibam Indrakumar, aged about 65 years, S/o Soibam Rajmani, a resident of Sagolband Tera Lukhram Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

*... Proforma Respondent*

**B E F O R E**

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

For the appellants : Mr. M. Rarry, Sr. Advocate instructed by Ms. Nikita, Advocate

For the respondents : Mr. N. Ibotombi, Sr. Advocate instructed by Mr. Leo, Advocate

Mr. N. Jotendro, Sr. Advocate instructed by Md. Syed Murtaza Ahmed, Advocate

Date of hearing : **30.01.2026**

Date of order/judgment : **30.01.2026**

**JUDGMENT & ORDER**  
**( O R A L )**

***[M. Sundar, CJ]***

[1] This order will dispose of captioned writ appeal and captioned miscellaneous case thereat.

[2] Election of office bearers and executive council, 'Manipur Olympic Association' ('MOA' for the sake of brevity) on 12.01.2024 is nucleus of the captioned matter and an order dated 19.01.2024 bearing reference No. 231 Q-Coop/Case/W.P.(C) No. 1 of 2024 made by the second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) pertaining to election of office bearers and executive council of MOA is the epicenter of the lis.

[3] At the outset, it is deemed appropriate to write that the captioned 'writ appeal' ('WA' for the sake of brevity) and 'miscellaneous case' ('MC' for the sake of brevity) thereat are in the admission Board, this Court after hearing learned State counsel for appellants, on being convinced prima facie case qua admission has been made out, issued notice to the respondents, counsel present in Court accepted notice for all three respondents, both sides agreed and consented to have the main WA heard out in the admission board today itself, based on such consent, the WA [along with MC thereat] were heard out and this order is being made.

[4] Factual matrix in a nutshell is that MOA is a society within the meaning of 'Manipur Societies Registration Act, 1989 (Manipur Act No. 1 of 1990)' which shall hereinafter be referred to as 'MSR Act' for the sake of brevity; that MOA was originally registered under the 'Societies Registration

Act, 1860 (21 of 1860)' and subsequently on coming into force of MSR Act, by operation of sub-Section (2) of Section 32 is deemed to have been registered under MSR Act; that it is to be noted that MSR Act received the assent of the President on 07.03.1990, it was published in Government of Manipur Gazette on 17.03.1990 and it kicked in (came into force) on 01.07.1990 vide notification dated 26.07.1990 which was published in Government of Manipur Gazette on 31.07.1990; that it is to be noted that MSR Act is a conditional legislation and State Government vide a notification in the official Gazette (on 31.07.1990) had appointed 01.07.1990 as the date on which MSR Act will come into force; that it is owing to this trajectory that we have written (for completion of facts) that 'MSR Act' kicked in (came into force) on and from 01.07.1990; that MOA has been registered with what is styled 'Memorandum of Association, Rules and Regulations' (which shall be collectively referred to as 'Bye-Laws' solely for the sake of convenience and clarity); that the Bye-Laws of MOA as placed before this Court shows that there are as many as 37 (thirty seven) members and all members are in turn societies; that the member societies which go by the nomenclature 'Association' pertain to various games i.e. Archery, Badminton, Basketball etc., and in the case on hand, we are concerned with one of the members namely, Manipur Judo Association; that it is to be noted that the '3<sup>rd</sup> respondent' ('R-3' for the sake of brevity and to be noted, similar abbreviations will be used in this order for other respondents) is General Secretary of 'Manipur Judo Association' ('MJA' for the sake of brevity); that the office bearers and executive council members of MOA

were elected qua earlier term on 19.08.2018 for a period of 4 (four) years and the four year term elapsed on 18.08.2022; that thereafter, a notice (post 18.08.2022) dated 14.10.2023 was issued by the 'council' of MOA convening AGM (Annual General Body Meeting) and for election of office bearers/executive council members on 25.11.2023 but the same could not be held on 25.11.2023 owing to 37<sup>th</sup> Goa National Games which were held between 25.10.2023 and 09.11.2023; that thereafter, another notice dated 23.12.2023 was issued by R-2 (to be noted that R-2 is a named individual but this Court is informed without any disputation that R-2 was Secretary General of MOA for the period between 19.08.2018 and 18.08.2022); that 23.12.2023 notice convened AGM and notified election on 14.01.20224; that it is to be noted that prior to this 23.12.2023 notice of R-2, MJA sent a representation to the Registrar of Societies (2<sup>nd</sup> appellant) dated 07.08.2023 inter alia seeking holding of elections, that MJA followed this up with a writ petition seeking mandamus qua this representation dated 17.08.2023 and this writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 641 of 2023 was disposed of by this Court on 14.09.2023 directing the second appellant to dispose of the representation; that the second appellant (interestingly and intriguingly) disposed of the representation on 23.10.2023 directing elections to be held; that thereafter, MJA sent a representation dated 26.12.2023 seeking appointment of ad-hoc committee for conducting elections followed by one more representation dated 29.12.2023 stating that holding of elections by a council whose term had elapsed is improper; that MJA followed this up with a writ petition being W.P.(C) No. of 1 of 2024

and the same came to be disposed of by a Hon'ble Single Bench of this Court in and by order dated 11.01.2024 directing second appellant to consider the two representations (26.12.2023 and 29.12.2023 representations) on its own merits and in terms of applicable Act/Rules/Bye-Laws and dispose of the same by issuing a speaking order; that it is pursuant to this order, the second appellant made the afore-referred 19.01.2024 order which has been described in the earlier part of this order as 'epicenter of the lis'; that in and vide 19.01.2024 order, second appellant cancelled the 23.12.2023 notice of R-2 and directed election of office bearers and executive council by issuing a slew of directions including appointment of Returning Officer by Directorate of Youth Affairs and Sports, notification in 2 (two) leading daily newspapers etc.; that, this 19.01.2024 order of second appellant was assailed by MOA and R-2 before us by way of a writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 68 of 2024; that this W.P.(C) No. 68 of 2024 was disposed of by a Hon'ble Single Bench vide judgment & order dated 08.07.2025 ('impugned order' for the sake of convenience); that Single Bench allowed the writ petition inter alia quashing the 19.01.2024 order of second appellant primarily on the ground that the second appellant does not have powers to make such an order; that aggrieved by the impugned order, State is on appeal vide captioned W.A.; that post issue of notice, acceptance of notice by respondents, main W.A. (along with MC thereat) was heard out as already alluded to supra.

[5] In the hearing today, Mr. M. Rarry, learned senior advocate for appellants instructed by Ms. Nikita, learned State counsel for appellants;

Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. Leo, learned counsel who accepted notice for R-1 & R-2 and Mr. N. Jotindra, learned senior advocate instructed by Md. Syed Murtaza Ahmed, learned counsel who accepted notice for R-3 are before this Court.

[6] As already alluded to supra, main WA (along with MC thereat) was taken up with consent of all senior counsel and counsel and the matter was heard out fully.

[7] At the outset, it is made clear that this Court wanted to know from the learned senior counsel for State as to the provision of law under which the second appellant had made 19.01.2024 order. Learned senior counsel submitted that it is an order made under Section 22 of MSR Act read with Rule 30 of the 'Manipur Societies Registration Rules, 2004' ('MSR Rules' for the sake of brevity and convenience). To be noted, Section 22 is a substantive provision and Rule 30 provides for the procedure for exercise of powers by second appellant under Section 22.

[8] Learned senior counsel contended that it cannot be gainsaid that second appellant does not have power to make 19.01.2024 order and in any case, the exercise of power was pursuant to judicial order dated 11.01.2024 in W.P.(C) No. 1 of 2024. It was emphatically contended by the learned senior counsel appearing for learned State counsel that election cannot be conducted by council of MOA post 18.08.2022 as the 4(four) years period for which the council was elected had elapsed. It was also pointed out that under the Bye-Laws of MOA, election rules have been made and the same has been approved by the executive council of MOA

on 25.06.2018 in this election rules, 'council' has been defined vide 2(ii) and that does not include for former council or a council whose term had elapsed. Learned senior counsel for State also made reference to a Division Bench judgment of Allahabad High Court being order dated 31.05.2017 made in the case of '**Vinod Kumar Varshney vs. Barauli Vidyalaya Samiti and baraoli bidyalaya samiti & Anr.'**' Learned senior counsel very fairly submitted that this Division Bench judgment of Allahabad High Court refers to a Full Bench judgment of Allahabad High Court but the same is being placed before this Court only qua persuasive value. This '**Vinod Kumar Varshney vs. Barauli Vidyalaya Samiti and baraoli bidyalaya samiti & Anr.'**' judgment was pressed into service to buttress the proposition that the moment Registrar of Societies steps in, a council of societies is denuded of its powers to convene an AGM. To be noted, notwithstanding myriad grounds in the memorandum of grounds of appeal, this is the sum and substance of contention of the learned senior counsel for State.

[9] Learned senior counsel for R-1 & R-2 contended that Section 22 of MSR Act read with Rule 30 of MSR Rules makes it clear that the second appellant should appoint an officer for conducting an inquiry, the officer on conclusion of inquiry should give a report to second appellant (Registrar), the Registrar in turn should send the report with his/her comments to the State Government and thereafter, after perusal of the comments of the Registrar, the State Government 'may' give direction as it may think fit to the society concerned for removal of defects and

irregularities within such time as may be specified and in default, the State Government may direct the Registrar to move a Court for dissolution of the society. Adumbration of the procedure vide Rule 30 of MSR Rules was also adverted to say that the same has been given a go-by. Learned senior counsel for R-1 & R-2 advertent to the 19.01.2024 order pointed out that the Registrar, i.e. second appellant, has cancelled only the 23.12.2023 notice issued by the R-2 and has not set aside the election. This is the crux and gravamen of the submissions of learned senior counsel for R-1 & 2.

[10] Learned senior counsel for R-3 supported the 19.01.2024 order and submitted that R-3 has petitioned the second appellant inter alia under Section 22 and pointed out that afore-referred representation dated 26.12.2023 makes a specific reference to Section 22 of MSR Act. This is the short the submission of learned senior counsel for R-3.

[11] This Court carefully considered the rival contentions, facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the societies, functions of the societies and also noticed that MOA and societies which are its members primarily function in the domain of promoting sports in the State of Manipur.

[12] This Court now proceeds to set out its discussion and dispositive reasoning on the points and counter points that fell for consideration, summation of which has been captured in the form of rival submission supra.

[13] At the outset, this Court deems it appropriate to extract and reproduce Section 22 of MSR Act and Rule 30 of MSR Rules, we do so and the same read as follows:

**Section 22 of MSR Act :**

**'22. Investigation of affairs of a society:-**

- (1) *Where on information received, the Registrar is of the opinion that there are circumstances suggesting that the business of a society is being conducted with intent to defraud its creditors, members or any other person, or that the society is guilty of mismanaging its affairs or of any fraudulent or unlawful act, he may order an inquiry into the matter of the information received and appoint an officer under him to inspect and inquire as directed.*
- (2) *It shall be the duty of every office bearer of the society when so required by the officer ordered to inquire; to produce any books and papers of or relating to the society which are in his custody and otherwise, to give to the officer all assistance in connection with the investigation or inspection, which he is reasonably able to give.*
- (3) *The officer may call upon and examine on oath any office-bearer of the society in relation to the affairs of the society and it shall be the duty of every office-bearer when so called upon to appear before such officer for such examination.*
- (4) *On the conclusion of the investigation of inspection, as the case may be, the officer shall make a report to the Registrar on the matters of which he was directed to report.*
- (5) *The Registrar shall send the report with his comments thereon to State Government. On perusal of such report and comments of the Registrar, the State Government may give such directions as it may think fit to the society for the removal of any defects or irregularities within such time as, may be specified and on the society making any default in taking action according to such direction, the State Government may direct the Registrar to move the court for dissolution of the society.'*

**Rule 30 of MSR Rules :**

**'30. Procedure and principles for fire conduct of enquiry and inspection under Section 22:**

- (1) *An order authorizing enquiry shall among, other things, contain the following –*
  - (a) *The name of the person authorized to conduct the enquiry*
  - (b) *The specific point or points on which the enquiry is to be made*
  - (c) *The name of the society whose affairs are to be enquired*
  - (d) *The period within the enquiry is to be completed and report to be submitted to the Registrar of Societies*
  - (e) *Cost of enquiry*
  - (f) *Any other matter relating to the enquiry*
- (2) *The enquiry may be done in any procedure as the Enquiry Officer thinks fit.*
- (3) *If the enquiry cannot be completed within the specified time in the order the person conducting the enquiry shall submit an interim report to the Registrar of Societies stating the reasons for failure to complete the enquiry report in time. If the Registrar of Societies is satisfied with the reason, he may extend the time or withdraw the enquiry and authorize another person to conduct the enquiry.*
- (4) *If the Registrar of Societies is of the opinion that re-enquiry is necessary, he may cause such re-enquiry. However, the reason for rejecting the first should be explicitly mentioned in the order for the enquiry.*
- (5) *The cost of enquiry fixed by the Registrar of Societies, if any, shall be paid the societies out of its fund.'*

[14] A careful perusal of Section 22 brings to light that second appellant can conduct inspection and inquiry by appointing an officer when there are circumstances suggesting (a) business of a society is being conducted with intent to defraud its (i) creditors, (ii) members or (iii) any other persons and (b) a society is guilty of (i) mismanagement of its affairs, (ii) any fraudulent or (iii) unlawful act. Though obvious we make it clear that the power of the Registrar is when the Registrar is of the opinion that there are 'circumstances suggesting' the 6 (six) situations which have been encapsulated in Section 22, an adumbration of which has been set out in the earlier point of this paragraph.

[15] In the case on hand, in the light of 26.12.2023 and 29.12.2023 representations from MJA, this Court is of the considered view that circumstances suggesting mismanagement of affairs of MOA qua conduct of elections (all elected unopposed and that too vide conduct of elections by a council whose term had elapsed) and therefore 2<sup>nd</sup> appellant Registrar cannot be found fault with for forming a opinion that there are circumstances suggesting mismanagement of MOA particularly unless 2<sup>nd</sup> appellant was examining the representations/complaints/information of MJA pursuant to/in the light of judicial order dated 11.01.2024 about which there is allusion supra warranting an investigation into the affairs of MOA under Section 22 exists. Therefore, the contention that second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) does not have power to investigate into the affairs of MOA does not find favour with this Court but the problem presents itself very differently for the appellants. The reason is, the exercise of power by second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) under Section 22 of MSR Act read with Rule 30 of MSR Rules is neither in accordance with the substantive provision namely, Section 22 nor in conformity with the procedure prescribed vide Rule 30 of MSR Rules. This Court has already extracted and reproduced both these provisions elsewhere supra in instant order. In the case on hand, the second appellant has not appointed an officer for inquiry into alleged mismanagement of affairs i.e. conducting election by a council after elapsing of its terms and the intriguing phenomenon of all office bearers and executive council being elected

unopposed. The report of the officer cannot culminate straightaway in an order of election by 2<sup>nd</sup> appellant as Registrar should have sent the report of the officer together with his/her comments to the State Government as already alluded to supra. The State Government thereafter can call upon MOA, if it finds that there are (defects and irregularities) to remove the same within a time to be specified and only in the event of the same not happening, the second appellant (Registrar) can be directed by the first appellant (Government of Manipur) to approach a Court for dissolution of society.

[16] Before proceeding further, this Court deems it appropriate to record what unfurled in the hearing with regard to report of Registrar to Government. This Court wanted to know from the learned senior counsel for State as to whether any report was sent by the Registrar to the State Government. In response to this query, learned senior counsel submitted on instructions that State is a party to the proceedings, it is aware of the proceedings of the Registrar and therefore, the question of sending a separate report does not arise. It was also submitted that State Government has given approval for filing of the instant appeal.

[17] Reverting to the discussion/dispositive reasoning, this Court is of the considered view that '***Vinod Kumar Varshney vs. Barauli Vidyalaya Samiti and baraoli bidyalaya samiti & Anr.***' do not come to the aid of appellants of this is not a case of convening AGM post commencement of Section 22 drill. Therefore, without expressing any

opinion one way or the other on the ratio, this Court examined the case at hand on its own merits.

[18] After careful examination of various provisions and in the light of submissions of all the learned senior counsel before this Court, this Court is of the view that the following points emerge:

(i) Second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) certainly has powers to investigate the affairs of a society (MOA in this case) under Section 22 of MSR Act when he/she, on information is of opinion that circumstances suggesting that a society is guilty of mismanagement of affairs has come to light. In the case at hand, conduct of election by council whose tenure had elapsed resulting in election of all office bearers and all members of executive council being elected unopposed viewed in the light of allegations of MJA (one of the members of MOA) that it is a make believe affair is certainly a circumstance which will prima facie qualify as information leading to opinion *qua* mismanagement of affairs of MOA. We hasten to add that we are not expressing any opinion that there is any mismanagement of affairs and we also equally hasten to have make it clear that we are not going to write that there is no mismanagement of affairs. The reason is the order which we propose to make about infra and we are only saying that 'opinion' of 2<sup>nd</sup> appellant qua Section 22 of MSR Act cannot be found fault with;

(ii) The exercise of power by second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) under Section 22 of MSR Act read with Rule 30 of MSR Rules is clearly not in conformity either with the substantive provision viz., Section 22 or in tune with procedural requirement qua Rule 30 of MSR Rules. When a member of a society i.e. MJA in this case, invokes Section 22 and approaches the Registrar by way of a representation (by way of complaint/information more particularly 26.12.2023 representation) qua election of office bearers and executive council, the same cannot be given a go by more particularly when there is a judicial order which mandamuses the second appellant to look into the complaint and pass a speaking order;

(iii) The sequitur which flows from the previous points is that the finding returned by the Hon'ble Single Bench that the second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) does not have powers deserves to be set aside in this intra Court appeal, though we are interfering with 19.01.2024 order on grounds of non-conformity with Section 22 and Rule 30 of MSR Act and MSR Rules respectively;

(iv) The 19.01.2024 order of the second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) deserves to be interfered with and set aside as it is not in conformity either with the

substantive provision (Section 22 of MSR Act) or the procedural requirement adumbrated in Rule 30 of MSR Rules;

(v) The complaint of MJA (a member of MOA) necessarily pertains to election held scheduled to held on 14.01.2024 but concluded on 12.01.2024 saying there is no contest on close of nomination. However, until the Registrar (second appellant) exercises powers in accordance with Section 22 read with Rule 30 gives a report to the State Government and the State Government, if convinced, also calls MOA to rectify/remove defects/irregularities, if any, in election scheduled to held on 14.01.2024 concluded on 12.01.2024 cannot be dislodged as outcome of Section 22 legal drill has to be awaited.

[19] As regards the argument of learned senior counsel for State that State Government is aware of the proceedings of Registrar inter alia as the State Government has given consent for filing instant intra Court appeal, this Court is of the considered view that this is no argument as Section 22 of MSR Act is clear as daylight that Registrar of Societies (2<sup>nd</sup> appellant) should send a report (with comments) to the State Government and the State Government should (if convinced) direct MOA to remove irregularities and make a course correction. Therefore, even on an extreme demurer, mere knowledge of State Government about the proceedings before Registrar culminating in the 19.01.2024 order can hardly be construed as

compliance with the basic requirement of Section 22 much less rigour of Section 22 of MSR Act.

In this regard, it is also deemed appropriate to write that it has not been contended that Registrar followed the procedure adumbrated in Rule 30 of MSR Rules for exercising powers under Section 22 and any event there is no material to suggest that the Registrar followed the procedure codified and prescribed vide subordinate legislation i.e. Rule 30 of MSR Rules.

In this regard, this Court deems it appropriate to write that the Registrar not adhering to the procedure / manner prescribed is a clear infraction of the celebrated ***Taylor vs. Taylor*** principle. ***Taylor vs. Taylor*** is reported in ***(1875) 1 Ch D 426, 431***. Celebrated ***Taylor vs. Taylor*** principle is that if manner of doing a particular Act is prescribed by a statute, the act must be done in that manner or not at all. To be noted, this oft quoted ***Taylor vs. Taylor*** principle has been repeatedly reiterated by our Hon'ble Supreme Court in a long line of authorities starting from ***State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Singhara Singh & Ors.*** reported in ***1963 SCC OnLine SC 23, Ramchandra Keshav Adke (Dead) by LRs. & Ors. vs. Govind Joti Chavare & Ors.*** reported in ***(1973) 1 SCC 559, Babu Verghese & Ors. vs. Bar Council of Kerala & Ors.*** reported in ***(1999) 3 SCC 422*** and ***Noor Mohammed vs. Khurram Pasha*** reported in ***(2022) 9 SCC 23***. In view of ***Taylor vs. Taylor*** principle being so well entrenched in our jurisprudence, this Court deems it appropriate to not to burden this order with the details of long line of authorities set out herein.

Suffice to write that this line of authorities reiterate ***Taylor vs. Taylor*** principle. This means that in the case at hand when the Registrar exercised power under Section 22, it ought to have been done in prescribed manner or not done at all but the latter option is unavailable as 2<sup>nd</sup> appellant was mandamus to act on MJA representation by a judicial order albeit in accordance with Act and Rules.

[20] Ergo, sequitur is, the following order is made.

(a) The finding in the order of the Hon'ble Single Bench (Single Bench Order dated 08.07.2025 made in W.P.(C) No. 68 of 2024) that the second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) does not have powers is set aside partly and clarified that while second appellant does not have powers to make orders akin to 19.01.2024 order under Section 22 of MSR Act, it certainly has powers to inspect/inquire into affairs of MOA if he is of the opinion that circumstances set out therein exist but the 19.01.2024 order bearing reference No. 231-Q-Coop/Case/W.P.(C) No. 1 of 2024 (Annexure – R/3), is set aside by this Court on the ground of non-conformity with Section 22 of MSR Act and Rule 30 of MSR Rules;

(b) While holding that the second appellant (Registrar of Societies Manipur) has powers under Section 22 to investigate, inspect and inquire into the affairs of the society on information qua circumstances suggesting mismanagement of affairs of MOA , we set aside the order

dated 19.01.2024 bearing reference No. 231-Q-Coop/Case/W.P.(C) No. 1 of 2024 (Annexure – R/3) of the second appellant (Registrar of Societies Manipur) on the ground that it is not in conformity with Section 22 and it has not adhered to the procedural requirement qua Rule 30 of MSR Rules;

(c) The second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) is directed to examine the complaints of MJA being complaints dated 26.12.2023 and 29.12.2023 by strictly following Section 22 of MSR Act and by adhering to Rule 30 of MSR Rules which provides for the procedure for exercise of powers under Section 22 of MSR Act. This de-novo exercise shall be commenced within a fortnight from today i.e. on or before 13.02.2026 and shall be concluded within 6 (six) weeks therefrom i.e. on or before 27.03.2026;

(d) As regards the afore-mentioned timelines, we make it clear that it is for the purpose of second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) to make a report and send it to the State Government. Post receipt of report of the second appellant (Registrar of Societies Manipur) being sent to the Government of Manipur, the State Government will act in accordance with sub-Section (5) of Section 22. If the report warrants issue of direction and if the State Government thinks it fit to give directions vide sub-Section (5) of Section 22, this

drill by the State Government (first appellant before us) shall be completed within 4 (four) weeks post 27.03.2026 i.e. on or before 24.04.2026;

(e) As this Court has fixed timelines for second appellant (Registrar of Societies, Manipur) for the drill under Section 22, it is deemed appropriate to write that all the parties concerned shall extend utmost cooperation to the second appellant in the drill to ensue vide Section 22 of MSR Act;

(f) Though obvious, for the purpose of specificity, it is clarified that until the decision of State Government and logical conclusion qua State Government, management of the affairs of MOA will be pursuant to 14.01.2024 election (concluded on 12.01.2024) as to whether these elections are a case of mismanagement of affairs of MOA is subject matter of the de-novo drill. This direction is given also owing to the reason that it may not be conducive to leave the administration of MOA in the abstract. This necessarily means that the office bearers and executive council, who are now in office pursuant to 14.01.2024 elections (concluded on 12.01.2024), shall continue to function but the decision taken will be subject to the outcome of the drill which is to ensue;

(g) As regards the de-novo drill that is to ensue pursuant to this order, we make it clear that all questions are left open, the second appellant shall proceed with the drill untrammelled

by any observation/s made in this order as such observation/s have been made for the limited purpose of disposal of the captioned WA and the captioned MC thereat;

(h) A communication from the Returning Officer qua MOA pertaining to the election suggests that the election was scheduled for 14.01.2024 but it was completed on 12.01.2024 as there was no contest. Therefore, for the sake of purpose specificity and clarity, this Court deems it appropriate to extract and reproduce the list of office bearers/executive council members vide notification dated 13.01.2024 as placed before this Court and the same is as follows:

*'OFFICE OF THE RETURNING OFFICER  
THE MANIPUR OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION ELECTION, 2024*

*NOTIFICATION  
Imphal the 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2024*

*No. 6/MOA/RO/2024 :List of Elected/Returned Candidates in connection with the Election – 2024 of Executive Council of MOA is hereby notified for general information thereof.*

*List of Elected/Returned Candidates*

*For Election of the post of President, MOA*

<i>Name of the Elected/Returned Candidate</i>	<i>Name of the Association</i>
<i>Sunil Elangbam</i>	<i>Manipur Weightlifting Association</i>

*For Election of the post of Senior Vice-President, MOA*

<i>Name of the Elected/Returned Candidate</i>	<i>Name of the Association</i>
<i>K. Baruni Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Amateur Kho-Kho Association</i>

*For Election of the Post of Vice – President, MOA*

<i>Name of Elected/Returned Candidate</i>	<i>Name of the Association</i>
<i>GA. Sanatomba Sharma</i>	<i>Manipur Archery Association</i>
<i>M. Ratankumar Singh</i>	<i>All Manipur Football Association</i>
<i>M. Rachandra Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Golf Association</i>
<i>Bobby Waikhom</i>	<i>All Manipur Taekwondo Association</i>
<i>T. Dushanta Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Yatching Association</i>
<i>M. Chourjit Singh</i>	<i>All Manipur Mukna Association</i>

*For Election of the post of Secretary General, MOA*

<i>Name of the Elected/Returned Candidate</i>	<i>Name of the Association</i>
<i>Longjam Jayantakumar Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Netball Association</i>

*For Election of the post of Joint Secretary, MOA*

<i>Name of the Elected/Returned Candidate</i>	<i>Name of the Association</i>
<i>N. Ibungochoubi</i>	<i>Manipur Equestrian Association</i>
<i>L. Shantakeshor Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Netball Association</i>
<i>Thounaojam Jayanta Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Table Tennis Association</i>
<i>Angom Johnson Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Bowling Association</i>

*For Election of the post of Treasurer, MOA*

<i>Name of Elected/Returned Candidate</i>	<i>Name of the Association</i>
<i>Kirankumar Thangjam</i>	<i>Manipur Amateur Karate-Do Association</i>

*For Election of the post of Executive Member, MOA*

<i>Name of the Elected / Returned Candidate</i>	<i>Name of the Association</i>
<i>Ito Tongbram</i>	<i>Athletics Association of Manipur</i>
<i>H. Sanjeev Sharma</i>	<i>Manipur Badminton Association</i>
<i>Takhellambam Brajabidhu Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Basketball Association</i>
<i>Yanglem Bony Singh</i>	<i>All Manipur Gymnastic Association</i>
<i>M. Madhusudon Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Amateur Kho-Kho Association</i>
<i>Ningthoukhongjam Rajendro Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Rifles Association</i>

<i>Thongam Samananda</i>	<i>Manipur Squash Rackets Association</i>
<i>H. Shashanka Shekhar Sharma</i>	<i>Manipur Tennis Association</i>
<i>Ngangbam Inaocha Singh</i>	<i>All Manipur Volleyball Association</i>
<i>Elangbam Sobha Singh</i>	<i>Manipur Kang Association</i>

*Sd/-  
(Chongtham Momon Singh)  
Returning Officer  
The Manipur Olympic Association  
Election, 2024'*

[21] In the light of narrative, discussion and dispositive reasoning thus far, captioned writ appeal is partly allowed with observations and directions with the timelines as above. Consequently, the captioned miscellaneous case therein is disposed of as closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**JUDGE**

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

***FR/NFR***

*Bipin*