

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

WP(C)No.395 of 2026

1. Smt. Smita Ngairangbam, aged about 39 years old, D/o Ngairangbam Iboyaima Singh, resident of Nagamapal Kangjabi Leirak Machin, PO Imphal & PS Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795004.
2. Smt. Arambam Kalpana Devi, aged about 40 years old D/o (Late) A., Mani Singh, resident of Thangmeiband Hijam Leikai, PO Imphal & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795004.
3. Shri Moirangthem Goroba Singh, aged about 35 years old S.o M. Tamphajao Singh, resident of Langathel Mamang Leikai, P.O. Wangjing & PS Khongjom Thoubal District, Manipur-795148.
4. Shri Kadamba Leitanthem, aged about 31 years old, S/o Rajen Leitanthem, resident of Langmeidong Bazar, Burmah Sugnu Road, PO Kakching & PS Waikhong, Kakching District, Manipur-795103.
5. Km. Konsam Sony Devi, aged about 26 years old D/o Konsam Gokul Singh, resident of Khurai Konsam Leikai PO Lamlong & PS Imphal East Imphal East District, Manipur-795010.
6. Shri Leishangthem Nongthang Singh, aged about 39 years old, S/o L. Sovachandra Singh, resident of Mongshangei School Leirak, PO Canchipur & P. S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-795003.
7. Km. Sanathoibi Chongtham, aged about 30 years old, D/o Ch. Priyokumar Meitei, resident of Nagamapal Chungkham Leirak, PO Imphal & PS Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
8. Km. Monika Saikhom, aged about 31 years old, D/o S. Priyokumar Singh, resident of Sagolband Sayang Kuraomakhong, PO Imphal & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
9. Km. Laishram Onida Devi, aged about 25 years old, D/o L. Basanta Meitei, resident of Sayang Konthoujam Leikai, PO Imphal & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

10. Smt. Leishichon Tallanao, aged about 43 years old, W/o Tharmingam Khangrah, resident of Sihai Khullen Village, Sihai, PO Ukhrul & P.S. Ukhrul, Ukhrul District, Manipur-795142.
11. Shri Simba Aheibam, aged about 30 years old, S/A. Romeo Singh, resident of Heirangoithong Aheibam Leirak, Ahongshangbam Leikai, PO Singjamei & PS Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-795008.
12. Km. Laishram Jumila Devi, aged about 27 years old, D/o L. Joy Singh, resident Thanga Ithing, PO Moirang & P.S. Keibul, Bishnupur District, Manipur-795005.
13. Smt. Wangkhem Geeta Devi, aged about 41 years old, W/o Konjengbam Bankim Singh, resident of Wangkhei Khunou, PO Porompat & PS. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795005.
14. A Loha, aged about 41 years old, D/o L. Adani, resident of Bazar Colony, Makhrelui, PO Senapati & P.S. Senapati, Senapati District, Manipur-795106.
15. H Theirila Thangal D/o H. Hopeson, resident of Tumnoupokpi, PO Kalapahar, P.S., Kangpokpi, Kangpokpi District, Manipur-795122.

Petitioners

Vs.

1. Manipur Public Service Commission, represented by the Secretary MPSC, North AOC, Imphal East, Pin-795001.
2. The State of Manipur, represented by the Chief Secretary, Secretariat South Block, Babupara, Imphal West, Manipur, Pin No: 795001.
3. Directorate of Handlooms & Textiles through the Director, Government of Manipur, Lamphelpat, PO & PS Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

Respondents

With
MC(WP(C)) No.413 of 2026

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH

(ORDER)

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

01.06.2026

[1] The following abbreviations/short forms have been used in this order:

Sl. No.	Abbreviation/Short Form/other references for the sake of brevity/convenience and/or clarity	Full Form/Expansion
1.	MPSC	Manipur Public Service Commission
2	said Rules	Manipur Public Service Commission (Procedure & Conduct of business), Rules 2011.
3.	WP	Writ Petition
4.	MC	Miscellaneous Case

[2] Captioned WP and captioned MC thereat are in the Admission Board. Mr. Keisham Kishan Singh, learned counsel on record for 15(fifteen) writ petitioners is before this Court.

[3] Factual matrix in a nutshell i.e., short facts shorn of details/elaboration not imperative for appreciating instant order are that MPSC issued a notification *qua* direct recruitment to 24(twenty) vacancies in 10(ten) different posts *vide* advertisement/notification dated 10.10.2024 bearing Advt.No.08/2022; that pursuant to the recruitment

notification/advertisement, the writ petitioners before this Court applied; that the writ petitioners sat for recruitment examinations on 15.03.2026 (wrongly mentioning as 13.03.2026 in paragraph 3 of the writ affidavit and learned counsel for writ petitioners submits that this is a typographical error); that thereafter the results of the written examinations were published; that MPSC issued a notification dated 13.05.2026 bearing reference *No.7/2/2022-MPSC(DR)(Vol-II)* notifying that interviews will be held on 26.05.2026; that thereafter MPSC issued another notification dated 20.05.2026 bearing reference *No.7/02/2022-MPSC(DR)* postponing the interview until further orders; that MPSC issued a further notification dated 27.05.2026 bearing reference *No. 7/2/2022-MPSC(DR)* fixing the interview on 06.06.2026 (this weekend i.e., Saturday); that at this juncture, the writ petitioners have filed captioned WP in this Court on 30.05.2026 *inter-alia* with a prayer to quash/set aside the written examinations conducted on 15.03.2026 pursuant to advertisement/notification dated 10.10.2024 besides assailing said Rules insofar as it does not prescribe procedures (according to writ petitioners) regarding safeguarding of question papers/booklets and also assailing certain specific provisions of said Rules pertaining to question paper setting; that it is to be noted that there is also one limb of prayer seeking appointment of an independent 'Facts Finding Committee' *qua* alleged procedural lapses in conduct of written examination (to be noted, procedural lapses according to writ petitioners); that captioned WP and captioned MC are in the Admission Board today as already alluded to in the earlier part of this factual matrix narration.

[4] Mr. Keisham Kishan Singh, learned counsel for writ petitioners submits that on 15.03.2026 when the written examination was held and when the writ petitioners admittedly took the written examination, they found that question booklets distributed to candidates were already unsealed/opened. Learned counsel for writ petitioners draws our attention to paragraph 8 of the writ affidavit which read as follows:

'8. That during the conduct of the examination on 15.03.2026, the petitioners and many other candidates found that the Question Booklets distributed to the candidates were already unsealed/opened despite the clear printed instruction on the first page of the Question Booklet stating: "Do not open this Question Booklet seal until you are told to do so" '

Learned counsel for writ petitioners further draws our attention to said Rules, more particularly Rule 26 (A) I and sub-rule (v) thereat. Learned counsel, predicating on this Rule his campaign *qua* prayers in the captioned WP, adverting to this sub-rule (v) of Rules 26 (A) I of said Rules submitted that the outer envelop has to be sealed with wax and the Chairman/Member has to put his signature at the opening edges of the envelop but this according to writ petitioners was not done and it was also submitted that signatures of the Supervisors were not affixed in the answer sheets. To be noted, this Court finds that invigilators have signed but learned counsel submitted that invigilators are different from Supervisors.

[5] This Court carefully considered the case of the writ petitioners predicated *inter-alia* on afore-referred submissions. This Court finds that entire captioned WP is based on alleged irregularities in conduct of written

examination on 15.03.2026. This means that the writ petitioners were fully aware of the alleged irregularities in conduct of written examinations on 15.03.2026 itself but the writ petitioners have chosen to wait for publication of the results of the written examinations, found themselves unsuccessful but further waited for notification of MPSC (to be noted, multiple notifications fixing, adjourning and re-scheduling) viva-voice/interview on 06.06.2026 and have filed the captioned WP in this Court day before yesterday i.e., on 30.05.2026 (Saturday). This in the considered opinion of this Court is clearly an eleventh hour nay 59th minute of eleventh attempt to assail, may be derail the recruitment proceedings after having participated in the written examinations and not having raised any issue regarding alleged irregularities *qua* written examinations on 15.03.2026.

[6] This Court finds that the said Rules are Rules of the year 2011, the same has been amended multiple times i.e., on 22.5.2017, 04.05.2020, 14.08.2020 and 07.09.2020. Said Rules which governed the notification/advertisement made on 10.10.2024 continue to operate. Writ petitioners responded to the notification and applied. Thereafter, there has been no amendment to said Rules. In this scenario, the writ petitioners without even assailing said Rules participated in the written examinations on 15.03.2026. The writ petitioners further waited for the results of the written examinations to be published. Post publication of written examination results, interview was notified, adjourned, re-notified and when it is scheduled to be held on 06.06.2026 for the successful candidates, writ petitioners have

rushed to this Court, more particularly when there has been no further amendment to said Rules which is operating from date of advertisement/notification in October of 2024 and continues to operate.

[7] In the above regard, this Court respectfully reminds itself of the principle laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in a long line of authorities including of ***Madan Lal & Others Vs. State of J & K & Others*** reported in ***(1995) 3 SCC 486***. On facts, ***Madan Lal*** is a matter pertaining to recruitment of Munsifs in Jammu & Kashmir and candidates after taking written examination and after participating in viva-voice, finding themselves unsuccessful and when they found that their cumulative scores in the written examination and viva-voice were not good enough to get recruited rushed to the Court assailing the entire process. In this factual backdrop, Hon'ble Supreme Court made it clear that candidates who find themselves to have not emerged successful and only because the results are not palatable cannot turn around and subsequently contend that the recruitment process was not properly done. This Court finds that on facts ***Madan Lal*** is a matter where the aspirants/candidates participated in written examination as well as viva-voice, thereafter found their cumulative scores not good enough to be recruited and rushed to the Court. In the case at hand, the candidates have come to Court after participating in the written examinations when the interview for the successful candidates is in the anvil (06.06.2026) though they had all the time in the world to approach this Court. In this case, this Court deems it appropriate to write that as already alluded to supra, the

entire captioned WP is predicated on alleged irregularities in conduct of written examinations on 15.03.2026 and what according to writ petitioners are certain lapses and lacunae in said Rules which have been operating from 2011 which was last amended in 2020 (07.09.2020 to be precise) and obviously remains unchanged from date of notification (10.10.2024) to date.

[8] This Court also finds that the writ petitioners have not chosen to array the successful candidates (in the written examinations) as co-respondents.

[9] Ergo, the sequitur of the narration, discussion and dispositive reasoning thus far is that this Court finds that the captioned WP does not pass muster in the Admission Board. The further sequitur is, captioned WP fails to pass muster in the Admission Board and the same is dismissed. Consequently, captioned MC thereat also perishes with captioned WP. This Court restrains itself and refrains from imposing costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

FR/NFR

John Kom

P.S. I : Upload forthwith.

P.S. II : All concerned to act on web copy of this proceedings/order uploaded in official website of High Court.