

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

WP(C) No. 424 of 2024

Shri Khwairakpam Ranjit Singh

...Petitioner/s

Vrs.

State of Manipur & 11 Ors.

...Respondent/s

With

MC(WP(C)) No. 368 of 2024

- B E F O R E -

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH

29.01.2026

Heard Mr. BR Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner; Mr. Shyam Sharma, learned GA appearing for respondent Nos. 1, 2 & 3 and Mrs. I. Bemola, learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 4. None appeared on behalf of respondent Nos. 5 to 12.

Office note dated 25-07-2024 indicated that no step has been taken for service of notice upon the respondent Nos. 5 to 12.

Mr. BR Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner prays for granting one week's time to allow the petitioner to take steps for service of notice upon the said respondent Nos. 5 to 12 by way of dasti service.

Prayer is allowed. Steps should be taken within one week and Petitioner is to file affidavit showing proof of service of such notice.

The case of the petitioner is that on the recommendation being made by the Government of Manipur for filling up 25 (twenty five) vacant posts of Extension Officer (Development) by promotion in the Directorate of Rural Development & Panchayati Raj (RD&PR), Government of Manipur, a Class-II DPC Meeting was held on 15-12-2022 at the MPSC.

It is the case of the petitioner that by the said DPC, he was recommended at Sl. No. 5 of the merit list for filling up against the post of UR vacancy. However, the State Government has not included his name while issuing the appointment order dated 08-11-2023.

In the affidavit-in-opposition filed by the MPSC, it has been categorically stated that the case of the petitioner was also considered and he was recommended for promotion against the post of UR vacancy and that issuing appointment order is in the domain of the State Government.

Mr. Shyam Sharma, learned GA appearing for the respondent Nos. 1, 2 & 3 submitted that no explanation has been given by the respondent No. 3, i.e. the Director (RD&PR), Government of Manipur in the affidavit-in-opposition filed by the respondent No. 3 as to why the petitioner's name was not included in the appointment order.

The learned GA, further submitted that he may be given one week's time to get instruction from the respondent Nos. 1 & 2 as to the reason for not including the name of the petitioner in the aforesaid appointment order.

In view of the submission made above, let these cases be listed again on 13-02-2026. On which date, the respondent Nos. 1 & 2 are directed to furnish necessary information and place before this Court without fail.

The counsel for the MPSC is also directed to produce the relevant official file on the next date of hearing.

A copy of this order be furnished to all the counsel appearing for the parties through their WhatsApp/e-mail during the course of the day for doing the needful.

JUDGE

Dhakeshori