

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

Review Petition No. 7 of 2023
Ref:- WP(C) No. 1145 of 2018

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Secretary (Power), Government of Manipur, P.O & P.S – Imphal, Pin No. 795001.
2. The Chief Engineer (Power), Electricity Department, Government of Manipur, P.O & P.S – Imphal, Pin No. 795001.
3. The Administrative Officer (Power) Imphal, Government of Manipur, P.O & P.S- Imphal Pin No. 795001.
4. The Manipur State Power Distribution Company Ltd. through its Managing Director, Keishampat, Government of Manipur, P.O & P.S- Imphal Pin No. 795001.
5. The Manipur State Power Distribution Company Ltd. through its Managing Director, Government of Manipur, P.O & P.S- Imphal Pin No. 795001.
6. The Chief Secretary (DP), Government of Manipur, P.O & P.S- Imphal, Pin No. 795001

***....Review Petitioners/
Respondents in Writ Petition***

-Versus-

1. Kabrabam Sanjoy Singh aged about 39 years, S/o (L) K. Kameshor Singh who is Ex-Head Lineman in the Electricity Department, Government of Manipur of Uripok Sorbol Thingel Kabrabam Leikai, P.O & P.S Imphal West District, Manipur
2. Lentin hao Kom aged about 33 years, S/o (L) Khomjir Kom who is Ex-JCC in the Electricity Department, Government of Manipur of Leimakhong Sadar Hills, P.O Mantripukhri, P.S

Gamnom Sapormeina, Kangpokpi District (now Senapati District), Manipur.

....Respondents

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SIDDHARTH MRIDUL

For the petitioner	::	Mr. S. Nepolean, GA
For the Respondents	::	Mr. S. Rupachandra, Sr. Adv.
Date of Hearing and Judgment & Order	::	14.12.2023

JUDGMENT AND ORDER
(ORAL)

1. The present Review Petition has been instituted on behalf of the State of Manipur seeking review of the judgment and order dated 8th December, 2021 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 1145 of 2018 whereby the said writ petition was allowed and the review petitioner was directed to reconsider the case of the petitioner under the Die-in-harness scheme for appointment to any commensurate post in terms of their educational qualification and further subject to fulfilling any other criteria under the relevant rules.

2. The solitary ground on which review of the said order dated 8th December, 2021 rendered by this Court is sought is that the learned Single Judge failed to consider that the Office Memorandum dated 6th June, 2007 was reported in widely circulated local newspaper "The Sangai Express" in its edition dated 9th June, 2007 and as such, the finding arrived at constituted an error on the face of the record.

3. Mr. S. Rupachandra, the learned senior counsel, appearing on behalf of the original petitioner, does not seriously oppose the present review petition subject, however, to his assertion that the order is tenable in the facts and circumstances of the case of the writ petition.

4. In view of the foregoing, the review petition is allowed.

5. The writ petition in WP(C) No. 1145 of 2018 is restored to its original number.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Sushil