

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

**Review Pet. No. 31 of 2025 with
MC(Review Pet.) No. 25 of 2025**

State of Manipur & Anr.

.....*Petitioner/s*

- Versus -

Karam Lakshmi Devi & 54 Ors.

.... *Respondent/s*

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA

**Order
(Oral)**

05.11.2025

[1] Heard Mr. Th. Sukumar, learned G.A. for the applicants/petitioners and Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. S. Gunabanta, learned counsel for the respondent/writ petitioner.

[2] By the present application under Section 114 of CPC, the petitioner is praying for review of the order dated 09.10.2025 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 809 of 2025.

[3] In WP(C) No. 809 of 2025, the writ petitioner challenged the final seniority list dated 15.11.2021 of the Craft Instructor (Engineering & Non-Engineering) in ITI, Manipur on the ground that the same is not on the basis of the merit or on the basis of the date of birth, when the incumbents are regularized on the same day vide order dated 16.12.2016.

[4] During the course of hearing, Mr. Th. Sukumar, learned G.A., refers to the letter dated 19.08.2025 submitted by the Joint Director of Craftsmen and Training, Manipur to the Secretary (Skill,

Labour, Employment & Entrepreneurship Department), Government of Manipur (SLEE) proposing a draft seniority list on the ground that the seniority list of 2021 is not updated till date and the same cannot be acted upon without reviewing and rectifying the anomalous.

[5] On the basis of submission, vide letter dated 19.08.2025 (supra), this Court disposed of the writ petition by granting two months time to the State respondent to consider the proposal submitted by the Directorate to the Administrative Department for review and rectification of the impugned seniority list dated 15.12.2021 within a period of two months. However, in para 13 of the order dated 09.10.2025, this Court grant permission to the State Government to approach for clarification for appointment of in-charge or otherwise if advised so. The order dated 09.10.2025 is reproduced as:

“[1] Heard Mr. HS Paonam, learned sr. counsel assisted by Mr. S. Gunabanta Meitei, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Th. Sukumar, learned GA on behalf of the State respondent nos. 1 & 2.

[2] By the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the final seniority list dated 15.12.2021 for the Craft Instructor (Engineering & Non-Engineering) in ITI, Manipur on the ground that the same is not on the basis of the merit or on the basis of the date of birth, when the incumbents are regularized on the same day vide letter dated 16.12.2016.

[3] It is also stated that the initial appointment on contractual/ ad-hoc basis was done after complying the due process.

[4] The learned sr. counsel for the petitioner has pointed out to the contents of letter dated 19.08.2025 written by Joint Director of Craftsmen and Training, Manipur to the Secretary, Skill, Labour, Employment & Entrepreneurship Department, Govt. of Manipur for review and rectification of the impugned seniority list dated 15.12.2021 on 2(two) grounds.

[5] It is also submitted that the suggestions made by the Department is pending with the State Govt.

[6] The learned sr. counsel for the petitioner submits that if the suggestions made by the Department is approved by the State Government, the cause of the writ petition will become infructuous and he submits that the present writ petition may be disposed of at this stage with an innocuous direction that the letter dated 19.08.2025 of

the Department may be considered by the State Govt. and pass an speaking order within a stipulated time.

[7] Mr. Th. Sukumar, learned GA for the State respondents submits that he has no objection in disposing the writ petition by passing an innocuous direction to the proposal submitted by the Department.

[8] This Court has perused the materials on record and the submissions made at the bar.

[9] If the suggestions of the Department in its letter dated 19.08.2025 is approved by the State Govt., the cause of the writ petition will become infructuous.

[10] In the circumstances, instead of issue notice the present writ petition i.e. W.P. (C) No. 809 of 2025 is disposed of at this stage by directing respondent no. 1 to consider the proposal submitted by the Joint Director of Craftsmen and Training, Govt. of Manipur for review and rectification of impugned seniority list dated 15.12.2021 within a period of 2(two) months' from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

[11] It is made clear that this Court does not express any opinion on the merit of the case.

[12] The MC(W.P. (C)) No. 744 of 2025 is also disposed of accordingly.

[13] In case of any urgent exigency of appointment of in-charge or otherwise, the State Govt. may approach this Court for clarification."

[6] In terms of para 13 of the order dated 09.10.2025, the State filed the present review petition seeking permission of this Court for making in-charge arrangement in respect of Principal, Government Women ITI, Takyel and Principal, Government ITI, Ukhrul as per rule by appropriately modifying the order dated 09.10.2025 passed in WP(C) No. 809 of 2025.

[7] The relief sought in this review petition is reproduced herein below:

- “(i) to admit this Review Petition and call for records of WP(C) No. 809 of 2025;*
- (ii) To allow the present petitioners to issue necessary order of in-charge arrangement in respect of Principal, Government Women ITI, Takyel and Principal, Government ITI, Ukhrul as per rule by appropriately modifying para 13 of the order dated 09.10.2025 passed in WP(C) No. 809 of 2025;*

- (iii) *To pass any other appropriate order or direction which the Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case;*
- (iv) *In the Interim, to allow the present petitioners to issue in-charge arrangement order in respect of Principal, Government Women ITI, Takyel and Principal, Government ITI, Ukhurul as per rule."*

[8] Mr. Th. Sukumar, learned G.A., submits that the State Government may be permitted to make in-charge appointment on the basis of 2021 seniority list.

[9] On the other hand, Mr. HS. Paonam, learned senior counsel for the writ petitioner/respondents herein, submits that since the department has admitted anomaly in seniority list of 2021, the same is under review by submitting draft proposal to the administrative department. It is urged that acting upon the seniority list of 2021 may not proper, as it will amount to leave out some other eligible officers because the list is not updated as admitted by the State authority itself in the letter dated 19.08.2025.

[10] It is also pointed out that the present application should not be filed as a review but for the modification of the earlier order dated 09.10.2025 and hence, the application is not maintainable in the present form.

[11] On perusal of the review petition filed by the petitioners, it is seen that the State authority is not arguing for review of the order itself, but is praying for modification in terms of para 13 of the order dated 09.10.2025 whereby the State was given liberty to approach this Court for in-charge appointment or otherwise. The application is for only clarifications or modifications of some conditions without affecting the main order. In the circumstances, this Court has considered the present application as application for modification of the order dated 09.10.2025.

[12] From the record, it is seen that vide order dated 19.06.2025 passed by coordinate bench of this Court in WP(C) No. 460 of 2024 while setting aside the in-charge appointment of some of the officers, the State authority was given liberty to consider the case of the

petitioners and the private respondents therein for appointment of fresh transfer and posting and also for in-charge appointment within a period of six weeks.

[13] It is submitted at the bar that due to non-compliance of the order dated 19.06.2025, the petitioners therein has filed contempt petition and the same is still pending.

[14] This Court has perused the order dated 19.06.2025 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 460 of 2024 and does not relate to the seniority list dated 15.12.2025. The order is simplicitor for giving liberty to the State to consider the case of the petitioners and private respondents therein for transferring and posting and also for in-charge appointment.

[15] However, in WP(C) No. 809 of 2025, the substantive prayer is challenge to the seniority list dated 15.12.2021 and admittedly, there was some anomaly in the same and in compliance of the earlier order passed in WP(C) No. 460 of 2024 and in terms of the proposal dated 19.08.2025 submitted by the directorate to the Administrative Department, WP(C) No. 809 of 2025 was closed with the direction to the authority to consider on the proposal submitted by the directorate within two months time. The seniority list dated 15.12.2021 cannot be considered as the same is admittedly held as defective by the department itself.

[16] This Court has considered the materials on record and the application for review as observed earlier.

[17] The application for review of the order dated 09.10.2025 in WP(C) No. 809 of 2025 will be treated as application for modification. Since the directorate has admitted in its letter dated 19.08.2025 that the seniority list dated 15.12.2021 is not updated and required review and rectification, this Court is of the view that if any in-charge appointment is made on the basis of the same, there is possibility of overlooking some eligible persons while making in-charge appointment.

[18] Since the draft seniority list submitted by the directorate to the administrative department is said to be in rectification of defects

in the seniority of 2021, it will suffice that the State authority is permitted to make in-charge appointment for 3 (three) months on the basis of the draft seniority list submitted by the directorate to the administrative department. During the meantime, the administrative department shall make endeavour to pass appropriate order to the draft seniority list submitted by the directorate.

[19] Accordingly, application is disposed of in terms of the above and this Court does not express any opinion on the merit of the draft seniority list submitted by the directorate to the administrative department. MC(Review Pet.) No. 25 of 2025 is closed.

[20] Furnish a copy of this order to the learned counsel for the parties in the course of the day.

JUDGE

Kh. Joshua Maring

KH.
JOSHUA
MARING

Digitally signed
by KH. JOSHUA
MARING
Date: 2025.11.05
16:11:07 +05'30'