

REPORTABLE

Suppl-1, Sl. Nos. 1-2 and 3-4

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

WA No. 5 of 2026

Ref:- WP(C) No. 138 of 2026

Shri Arambam Somarendro Singh, aged about 59 years old
S/o. Arambam Munindro Singh, a resident of Lilong Chajing
Mairenkhong, Lilong Chajing, P.O. & P.S. Lilong, Imphal
West, Manipur-795130.

Appellant

Vs.

1. The State of Manipur through Commissioner/Secretary,
(SIRD/RD & PR), Government of Manipur having its
office at Secretariat Complex, Mantripukhri, P.O.
Mantripukhri & P.S. Heingang, Imphal, Imphal East
District, Manipur -795002.
2. The Director, (SIRD/RD & PR) Manipur having its office
at SIRD Complex, Porompat, P.O. & P.S. Porompat,
Imphal East District, Manipur -795001.

Respondents

With MC(WA) No. 8 of 2026

Ref:- WA No. 5 of 2026

With

WA No. 6 of 2026

Ref:- WP(C) No. 863 of 2025

Shri Arambam Somarendro Singh, aged about 59 years old
S/o. Arambam Munindro Singh, a resident of Lilong Chajing
Mairenkhong, Lilong Chajing, P.O. & P.S. Lilong, Imphal
West, Manipur-795130.

Appellant

Vs.

1. The State of Manipur through Commissioner/Secretary,
(SIRD/RD & PR), Government of Manipur having its
office at Secretariat Complex, Mantripukhri, P.O.
Mantripukhri & P.S. Heingang, Imphal, Imphal East
District, Manipur -795002.
2. The Director, (SIRD/RD & PR) Manipur having its office
at SIRD Complex, Porompat, P.O. & P.S. Porompat,
Imphal East District, Manipur -795001.

Respondents

With MC(WA) No. 9 of 2026

Ref:- WA No. 6 of 2026

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

ORDER

(Order of the court was made by M. Sundar, CJ)

20.02.2026

[1] Captioned 2 (two) Writ Appeals ('WAs' in plural and 'WA' in singular for the sake of convenience) are directed against an interim order dated 18.02.2026 made in MC(WP(C)) No. 143 of 2026 in WP(C) No. 138 of 2026 (wrongly mentioned as an order in WP(C) No. 143 of 2026 in the prayer for which counsel on record Mr. Syed Murtaza Ahmed expresses regret). Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. Syed Murtaza Ahmed, learned counsel on record for the appellant in both WAs is before this Court.

[2] The afore-referred order dated 18.02.2026 made in MC(WP(C)) No. 143 of 2026 in WP(C) No. 138 of 2026 by a Hon'ble Single Bench shall be referred to as 'impugned order' for the sake of brevity and convenience. To be noted, when the impugned order was made by Hon'ble Single Bench WP(C) No. 138 of 2026 along with MC (WP(C)) No. 143 of 2026 stood tagged with WP(C) No. 863 of 2025 and MC(WP(C)) No. 790 of 2025 thereat. Therefore, the writ appellant has filed 2 (two) WAs though both WAs assail the same impugned order.

[3] Factual matrix in a nutshell is that the date of birth of writ appellant (Shri Arambam Somarendro Singh is the writ appellant) is 01.03.1966; that a Notification dated 11.12.2007 was issued by the 'State

Institute of Rural Development' ('SIRD') inviting applications from eligible candidates for the post of '**faculty members**' in SIRD on contract basis for 1 (one) year; that this Notification was for 4 (four) posts described as '**Non-core Faculty**' in Agriculture, Fishery, Veterinary & Animal Husbandry and Rural Engineering; that the writ appellant responded to this Notification i.e., writ appellant applied; that on recommendation on Selection Committee, the writ appellant was appointed as '**Non-core Faculty**' on contract basis in SIRD on consolidated pay; that thereafter, in and by an order made by 'Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Department' ('RD & PR Dept.'), Government of Manipur, a total of 68 (sixty eight) persons including the writ appellant were regularized and absorbed as faculty staff in various categories in RD & PR Dept., Government of Manipur; that thereafter, on 22.09.2018, Government of Manipur issued a Notification enhancing the age of superannuation from 60 to 62 with immediate effect but for officers of 'Manipur Veterinary & Animal Husbandry Service' ('MV & AHS'); that the writ appellant almost more than 6 (six) years later, sent a representation dated 28.02.2025 with a request to extend the benefit of enhancing of superannuation from 60 to 62 years to him also; that thereafter, alleging inaction qua this representation dated 28.02.2025, writ appellant came to this Court by way of a writ petition being WP(C) No. 536 of 2025; that this WP(C) No. 536 of 2025 came to be disposed of by a Single Bench of this Court dated 01.08.2025 inter- alia directing the 28.02.2025 representation of petitioner to be considered on its own merit in accordance with rules and

further directing disposal of the same by issuing a speaking order; that thereafter, the Directorate of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj (RD & PR) disposed of the representation by a speaking order dated 24.10.2025 holding that writ appellant is working in RD & PR Dept. whereas the 22.09.2025 Notification increasing the superannuation age from 60 to 62 is only for MV & AHS Dept.; that thereafter, an order dated 02.01.2026 was made by the RD & PR Department saying that the writ appellant on attaining age of superannuation with effect from 28.02.2026 (A/N) will stand terminated; that assailing this 24.10.2025 order rejecting writ petitioner's representation dated 28.02.2025 and the 02.01.2026 order stating that the writ petitioner will attain superannuation on 28.02.2026 (on attaining the age of 60 years), writ appellant came to this Court by way of 2 (two) writ petitions viz., afore-referred WP(C) No. 863 of 2025 along with MC thereat and WP(C) No. 138 of 2026 along with a MC thereat; that both the WPs were tagged and on Board before the Hon'ble Single Bench which made the impugned order; that the impugned order is an interim order as already alluded to supra and the interim order was made in MC seeking stay of 02.01.2026 order of superannuation/termination on 28.02.2026; that in the interim order, Hon'ble Single Bench refused to suspend the operation of the 02.01.2026 order, made it clear that if the writ appellant succeeds in the writ petitions, he will be entitled to receive all the 'service benefits'; that this order has not been assailed by State but it has been assailed by the writ

appellant who is writ petitioner in both the writ petitions viz., WP(C) no. 138 of 2026 and WP(C) No. 863 of 2025.

[4] Mr. Jotendro, learned senior counsel submitted that the impugned order has been made primarily on the point that a person appointed as Veterinary Assistant Surgeon in MV & AHS Dept. cannot be equated with a faculty in RD & PR Dept.. In this regard, learned senior counsel drew the attention of this Court to paragraph 10 of the impugned order and submitted that the writ petitioner, in his campaign for interim order, predicated his argument on the ground that one Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh serving as Veterinary Assistant Surgeon was given this benefit more so, pursuant to order of this Court in WP(C) No. 748 of 2023.

[5] Issue notice in both captioned WAs and both captioned MCs.

[6] Mr. W. Niranjit, learned State Counsel accepts notice for both respondents in both WAs and both MCs. Mr. RK Umakanta, learned senior counsel appears on his behalf and he is also before this Court.

[7] This Court took up the main WAs in the admission board itself with the consent of learned senior counsel and counsel on record on both sides. The main writ appeals were heard out.

[8] Learned senior counsel for appellants predicated his campaign in the WAs primarily on the point that the writ appellant is very well qualified as he has Bachelors Degree in Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry (including compulsory internship), he holds the Masters

degree (Gold Medalist), a Doctorate and he is double qualified with regard to 'National Eligibility Test' (referred to as 'NET' in the memorandum of appeal without giving expansion of the abbreviation and expansion was mentioned in the hearing⁰. Learned senior counsel submitted that writ appellant is more qualified than Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh who is now serving as Veterinary doctor in Manipur Zoological Garden under the Department of Forest and Environment.

[9] Learned senior counsel also submitted that it is imperative that the writ appellant is permitted to continue his service and he is more concerned about service than salary.

[10] In response to the afore-referred arguments, learned senior counsel appearing for the State Counsel submitted that allowing the captioned WAs will tantamount to giving final relief to the writ appellant i.e., final reliefs sought for in the afore-referred writ petitions and he also submitted that this will tantamount to usurpation of a public office without requisite Notification. Be that as it may, learned State Counsel emphasized the point that the RD & PR Dept. is very different from MV & AHS Dept. It is the emphatic say of learned State Counsel that the 22.09.2018 Notification enhancing superannuation age from 60 to 62 is applicable only to those working in MV & AHS Dept. and it cannot be extended to those working in RD & PR Dept. It was pointed out that the writ appellant was working in RD & PR as a '**faculty**' which is very different from the functions of a '**Veterinary doctor**' in MV & AHS.

[11] This Court carefully considered the rival submissions.

[12] The discussion and dispositive reasoning of this Court is as follows :

- i) Before delving into discussion on the rival contentions, it is necessary to advert to earlier Single Bench order dated 05.07.2024 made in WP(C) No. 748 of 2023 in the case of one Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh as the primary plank of the writ appellant is claiming parity with Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh. In this order dated 05.07.2024 made in WP(C) No. 748 of 2023, the benefit of enhancement of superannuation age from 60 to 62 vide Notification 22.09.2018 was extended to Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh on the basis that he is working as Veterinary Officer in Manipur Zoological Garden which is under the Department of Forest and Environment and when the superannuation enhancement benefit has been extended to medical officers and Veterinary officers in ADC (Autonomous District Councils) there is no reason why it should not be extended to Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh who is discharging a similar function. In this view of the matter, this Court finds that Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh is differently placed as he is working as a '**Veterinary doctor**' and not as a '**faculty**' but he was working as Veterinary

officer/doctor in Manipur Zoological Garden. Therefore, the reference to order dated 05.07.2024 in WP(C) No. 748 of 2023 is misplaced and it does not come to the aid of the appellant;

- ii) The contention of the writ appellant that the writ appellant is more concerned with service than with salary does not weigh with this Court as Hon'ble Single Bench in the impugned order has made it clear that in the event of the writ petitioner succeeding in the writ petitions, he will be entitled to receive all '**service benefits**'. This means that the writ appellant would necessarily get all service benefits including salary. To be noted, this point is not disputed by learned State Counsel and as already alluded to supra, State has not assailed the impugned order.
- (iii) As regards our finding that Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh's case is on a different footing, we make it clear that this Court has held that Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh is on a different footing only with regard to his case in WP(C) No. 748 of 2023 as in WP(C) No. 748 of 2023, it was a case where he was working as Veterinary officer in Manipur Zoological Garden and was denied the

benefit of enhancement of superannuation age only on the ground that he is in MV & AHS Dept. though such benefit has been extended to medical officers and Veterinary officers in ADCs (Autonomous District Councils). This means that as regards the claim of the writ petitioner i.e., writ petitioner's claim of parity with Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh, the same can be considered by the Hon'ble Single Judge when the main WPs are heard out. To put it differently, for the sake of specificity, we clarify that Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh's claim of parity with Veterinary Surgeons in MV & AHS in WP(C) No. 748 of 2023 is very different from writ petitioner's claim for parity with MV & AHS and particularly Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh as those in MV & AHS are working as '**Veterinary doctors**' whereas writ appellant is working as '**faculty**' in RD & PR Dept. However, now that the benefit of the enhancement of superannuation vide 22.09.2025 Notification has been extended to Dr. Laishram Saratchandra Singh, it is open to the Hon'ble Single Judge to consider writ appellant's claim for parity with him. For the sake of abundant clarity and specificity, we deem it appropriate to write that while parity qua '**Veterinary doctors**' working in Zoological Garden

and MV & AHS is settled, claim of parity between
'**faculty** in **RD & PR**' and '**Veterinary doctors** in
MV & AHS' is left open.

[13] Before we part with the matter, we request the Hon'ble Single Bench to hear out and dispose of the 2 (two) WPs viz., WP(C) No. 863 of 2025 and WP(C) No. 138 of 2026 and MCs thereat along with WP being WP(C) No. 126 of 2026 (assailing stoppage of Non-practicing allowance) as expeditiously as the Board of Hon'ble Single Bench would permit. Learned counsel on both sides as well as Mr. M. Rendy, learned counsel on record for writ petitioner in WP(C) No. 126 of 2026 who is present in Court undertake to co-operate in expeditious disposal of the 3 (three) writ petitions.

[14] In the light of the narrative, discussion and dispositive reasoning thus far, captioned main WAs fail and the same are dismissed albeit with afore-referred observations. Consequently, captioned MCs thereat also perish with the WAs and the same are also dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

FR/NFR

Sushil

UPLOAD FORTWITH