

Sl. Nos. 3, 4 & 5

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

Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025

Laishram Nabakumar Singh and 9 others

Petitioners

Vs.

State of Manipur and 8 others

Respondents

Clubbed with Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025

With Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025

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)

15.12.2025

[1] Captioned 3 (three) review petitions have been filed by third parties seeking review of a common judgment dated 29.08.2025 made in Writ Appeal Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 ('impugned common judgment' for convenience).

[2] Mr. S. Biswajit, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record for the review petitioners is before this Court.

[3] Learned senior counsel, adverting to orders dated 07.11.2025 and 02.12.2025 made in MC(Review.Pet.) Nos. 13, 14 and 15 of 2025, submitted that for the selfsame reasons, the captioned review petitions are being pursued. To be noted, the afore-referred

orders dated 07.11.2025 and 02.12.2025 [to be noted, one order dated 07.11.2025 in MC(Review.Pet.) No. 13 of 2025 and two separate orders both dated 02.12.2025 one in MC(Review.Pet.) No. 14 of 2025 and another in MC(Review. Pet.) No. 15 of 2025] are orders vide which the review petitioners in the captioned Review Petitions were granted third party leave.

[4] This Court deems it appropriate to extract and reproduce the aforesaid 3 (three) orders which read as follows :

‘07.11.2025

[1] Captioned Misc. case has been filed by 10 (ten) individuals seeking leave to file third party review qua an order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. No. 11 of 2024.

[2] Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record for the applicants submits that the petitioners were members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads in State of Manipur, having been appointed either by the State Government or pursuant to an interim order dated 29.02.2024 made in a Misc. case in W.A. No. 11 of 2024 and/or are orders in other Misc. cases in connected appeals being W.A. Nos. 9 and 10 of 2024.

[3] In the normal circumstances, grant of leave to a third party to seek review of a judicial order of a court is matter between the court and the petitioners seeking leave but in the instant case, considering the nature of the matter which involves larger public interest, this court issued notice to the respondents on 26.09.2025.

[4] Post issue of notice, today, Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel has entered appearance on behalf of R1 to R3 and Ms. Th. Lekhakumari, learned counsel, has entered appearance on behalf the R4 to R9. Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General and senior counsel appears on behalf of Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State Counsel as regards R1 to R3 and Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior advocate appears on behalf Ms. Lekhakumari for R4 to R9.

[5] At the outset, Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei very fairly submitted that the petitioners in the captioned Misc. case accept the verdict dated 29.08.2025 which is a common order in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 but they are seeking very limited review as regards ongoing works pertaining to civic amenities. This submission of the learned senior counsel made on instructions from the counsel on record is recorded.

[6] As regards the respondents, learned Advocate General very fairly submitted that the constitutional right of the petitioners to seek limited review as above cannot be curtailed or stifled and that the State itself has already filed a review petition but review petition of State is not limited and it is a full-fledged review.

[7] As regards private respondents, senior advocate Mr. HS Paonam submitted that other members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads were before the court when the Division Bench rendered the common order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 and therefore, the petitioners cannot now be heard to contend that review is necessary.

[8] We carefully considered the submissions made on both sides. We find that the fair submission made by learned senior counsel for petitioners that what is sought is not a full-fledged review and only a limited review and that too limited to

civic amenities for which work is in progress as larger public interest comes into play, we deem it appropriate to allow the captioned misc. case but with a rider that only a limited review as projected by the petitioner will be heard out, obviously, on its own merits and in accordance with law.

[9] Captioned Misc. case ordered/disposed of in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.'

'02.12.2025

[1] Captioned Misc. case has been filed by 10 (ten) individuals seeking leave to file third party review qua an order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. No. 10 of 2024.

[2] Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record for the applicants submits that the petitioners were members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads in State of Manipur, having been appointed either by the State Government or pursuant to an interim order dated 29.02.2024 made in Misc. cases in W.A. No.10 of 2024 and in connected appeals being W.A. Nos. 9 and 11 of 2024.

[3] In the normal circumstances, grant of leave to a third party to seek review of a judicial order of a court is a matter between the court and the petitioners seeking leave but in the instant case, considering the nature of the matter which involves larger public interest, this court issued notice to the respondents on 26.09.2025.

[4] Post issue of notice, today, Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel has entered appearance on behalf of R1 to R8. To be noted, 'R1' denotes 1st respondent and similar abbreviations are being used with regard to other respondents also in the instant order. Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel, has entered appearance on behalf of the R10, R11, R12, R14, R15, R16, R17, R19 and R20. Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate

General and senior counsel appears on behalf of Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State Counsel. Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior advocate appears on behalf of Mr. A. Arunkumar for private respondents set out in the earlier part of this paragraph. As regards R9, Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel is before this Court. To be noted, with regard to other private respondents though they have been duly served and their names have been shown in the cause list, they have neither entered appearance through a counsel nor chosen to come before this Court. Therefore, the matter is being heard out on the basis of the parties who are before this Court.

[5] At the outset, Mr. W. Sanatomba, learned counsel very fairly submitted that the petitioners in the captioned Misc. case accept the verdict dated 29.08.2025 which is a common order in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 but they are seeking very limited review as regards ongoing works pertaining to civic amenities. This submission of the learned counsel for applicants made on instructions is recorded.

[6] As regards the respondents, learned Advocate General very fairly submitted that the constitutional right of the petitioners to seek limited review as above cannot be curtailed or stifled and that the State itself has already filed a review petition but review petition of State is not limited and it is a full-fledged review.

[7] As regards private respondents, senior advocate Mr. HS Paonam and Mr. Ch. Momon submitted that other members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads were before the court when the Division Bench rendered the common order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 and therefore, the petitioners cannot now be heard to contend that review is necessary. However, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior

advocate and Mr. Ch. Momon, learned counsel with the usual fairness, submitted that as MC(Review. Pet.) No. 13 of 2025 has been allowed by this Court by an order dated 07.11.2025, a similar order can be made in the captioned Misc. case also.

[8] We carefully considered the submissions made on both sides. We find that the fair submission made by learned counsel for applicants that what is sought is not a full-fledged review and only a limited review and that too limited to civic amenities for which work is in progress, as larger public interest comes into play, we deem it appropriate to allow the captioned misc. case but with a rider that only a limited review as projected by the applicants will be heard out, obviously, on its own merits and in accordance with law.

[9] Captioned Misc. case ordered/disposed of in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.

[10] The main review petitions on being numbered pursuant to the third party leave that has been granted vide instant order and also review petition pursuant to third party leave granted in MC(Review. Pet.) No. 13 of 2025 on 07.11.2025 shall be listed along with the State review petitioners being Review Pet. No. 33 of 2025, Review Pet. No. 34 of 2025 and Review Pet. No. 35 of 2025 on 15.12.2025.’

‘02.12.2025

[1] Captioned Misc. case has been filed by 10 (ten) individuals seeking leave to file third party review qua an order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. No. 9 of 2024.

[2] Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record for the applicants submits that the petitioners were members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads in State of Manipur, having been appointed either by the State Government or pursuant to an interim order dated 29.02.2024

made in Misc. cases in W.A. No.9 of 2024 and in connected appeals being W.A. Nos. 10 and 11 of 2024.

[3] In the normal circumstances, grant of leave to a third party to seek review of a judicial order of a court is a matter between the court and the petitioners seeking leave but in the instant case, considering the nature of the matter which involves larger public interest, this court issued notice to the respondents on 26.09.2025.

[4] Post issue of notice, today, Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel has entered appearance on behalf of R1 to R8. To be noted, 'R1' denotes first respondent and similar abbreviations are being used with regard to other respondents also in the instant order. Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel, has entered appearance on behalf of the R16, R17, R18, R19 and R21. Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General and senior counsel appears on behalf of Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State Counsel. Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior advocate appears on behalf of Mr. A. Arunkumar for private respondents set out in the earlier part of this paragraph. As regards R9 to R15, Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel is before this Court. To be noted, with regard to other private respondents though they have been duly served and their names have been shown in the cause list, they have neither entered appearance through a counsel nor chosen to come before this Court. Therefore, the matter is being heard out on the basis of the parties who are before this Court.

[5] At the outset, Mr. W. Sanatomba, learned counsel very fairly submitted that the petitioners in the captioned Misc. case accept the verdict dated 29.08.2025 which is a common order in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 but they are seeking very limited review as regards ongoing works pertaining to civic amenities. This submission of the learned counsel for applicants made on instructions is recorded.

[6] As regards the respondents, learned Advocate General very fairly submitted that the constitutional right of the petitioners to seek limited review as above cannot be curtailed or stifled and that the State itself has already filed a review petition but review petition of State is not limited and it is a full-fledged review.

[7] As regards private respondents, senior advocate Mr. HS Paonam and Ms. Ayangleima submitted that other members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads were before the court when the Division Bench rendered the common order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 and therefore, the petitioners cannot now be heard to contend that review is necessary. However, Mr. HS Paonam, learned senior advocate and Ms. Ayangleima, learned counsel with the usual fairness, submitted that as MC(Review. Pet.) No. 13 of 2025 has been allowed by this Court by an order dated 07.11.2025, a similar order can be made in the captioned Misc. case also.

[8] We carefully considered the submissions made on both sides. We find that the fair submission made by learned counsel for applicants that what is sought is not a full-fledged review and only a limited review and that too limited to civic amenities for which work is in progress, as larger public interest comes into play, we deem it appropriate to allow the captioned misc. case but with a rider that only a limited review as projected by the applicants will be heard out, obviously, on its own merits and in accordance with law.

[9] Captioned Misc. case ordered/disposed of in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.

[10] The main review petitions on being numbered pursuant to the third party leave that has been granted vide instant order and also review petition pursuant to third party leave

granted in MC(Review. Pet.) No. 13 of 2025 on 07.11.2025 shall be listed along with the State review petitioners being Review Pet. No. 33 of 2025, Review Pet. No. 34 of 2025 and Review Pet. No. 35 of 2025 on 15.12.2025.’

[5] In the light of the narrative thus far, issue notice to respondents.

[6] Mr. A. Arunkumar, learned counsel who is present in court accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 4 to 9 in Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, for Respondent Nos. 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 in Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025 and for Respondent Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 in Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025. Ms. L. Ayangleima, learned counsel who is in court, accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 9 to 15 in Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025. Mr. O. Ratan Kumar, learned State counsel who is in court, accepts notice for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 in Review. Pet. No. 37 of 2025, for Respondent Nos. 1 to 8 in Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025 and for respondent Nos. 1 to 8 in Review. Pet. No. 39 of 2025 and for Respondent Nos. 1 to 8 in Review. Pet. No. 38 of 2025. With regard to other respondents, notice is returnable by 12.01.2026. Dasti notice is also permitted.

[7] List on 12.01.2026.

Sushil

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE