

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 9323/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 20-11-2025 in WA No. 46/2021 passed by the High Court of Manipur at Imphal]

THOKCHOM CHHATRAJIT SINGH & ORS. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

LOUREMBAM IBOYAIMA SINGH & ORS. Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 74615/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 17-03-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.V. ANJARIA

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. B P Sahu, Sr. Adv.
Mrs. Rajani K Prasad, Adv.
Mr. B. Krishna Prasad, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Ahanthem Henry, Adv.
Mr. Ahanthem Rohen Singh, Adv.
Mr. Mohan Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aniket Rajput, Adv.
Ms. Khoisnam Nirmala Devi, Adv.
Ms. Anne Mathew, AOR
Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Sr. Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The private respondent(s) were appointed on contractual basis in the Manipur Technical University, when the University was opened in the year 2016, and there was immediate need of faculty. Thereafter, the private respondent(s) preferred Writ Petition before Single Judge

seeking regularization which was allowed *vide* order dated 20.09.2018, consequent to which the petitioner(s)' services were regularized with effect from their initial date of joining on contractual basis. This order of regularization was issued on 17.08.2020 (Annexure P-17). Thereafter, the petitioner(s) preferred Writ Petition No. 344 of 2020, challenging the Government's decision to regularize the private respondent(s) and the formal order issued in this regard.

2. The said Writ Petition was dismissed by the Single Judge *vide* order dated 30.12.2020 and the same has attained finality.

3. The petitioner(s) who were not a party to the W.P. (C) No.519 of 2018 by which Single Judge directed the regularization of private respondent(s), preferred the present Writ Appeal and the same has been dismissed on merits.

4. Having heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner(s) and for the private respondent(s)/cavetor(s), we are of the considered view that the High Court has taken the correct view, by noting that once the petitioner(s) Writ Petition W.P.(C) No.344 of 2020 has been dismissed, they cannot maintain an intra-Court Appeal to challenge the order passed by the High Court in W.P.(C) No.519 of 2018.

5. Even otherwise, the date on which the private respondent(s) were appointed on contractual basis, which is the date from which they have been regularized, the present petitioner(s) were not borne in the cadre, as they were

appointed on 17.12.2018. Thus, once the regularization of private respondent(s) has been held good, the private respondent(s) would be senior to the petitioner(s) as they were appointed prior in point of time.

6. The High Court has not committed any error by dismissing the Writ Appeal of the petitioner(s) under the impugned order. Accordingly, the Special Leave Petition is dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(MINI)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(CHETNA BALOONI)
COURT MASTER (NSH)