

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

PIL No. 3 of 2024

Sarungbam Medini Devi

Petitioner

Vs.

State of Manipur; & Ors.

Respondents

BEFORE

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SIDDHARTH MRIDUL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH**

20.03.2024

Siddharth Mridul, C.J.:

Mr. B. Prem Sharma, learned counsel, appears on behalf of the petitioner; and Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General, Manipur, appears on behalf of the State respondents.

The present petition is manifestly an abuse of the process of Court, inasmuch as, there are no substantive factual averments in the body thereof which require adjudication by this Court.

Mr. B. Prem Sharma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, on a specific query from the Bench, is completely unable to indicate any averment of facts that require determination in the present petition.

It is, however, observed that in paragraph No. 18 of the present petition, it is stated as under :-

18. That, it is noteworthy to mention that during a periodical meeting at the High Court Legal Services Committee (HCLSC), High Court of Manipur, Panel Lawyer B. Prem Sharma raised an issue regarding the inconvenience of obtaining FIR copies from Police Stations. He pointed out

that Singjamei Police Station, where the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court were displayed on a notice board, set a commendable example. Panel Lawyer advocated for similar notice boards to be installed in all Police Stations. After considering the proposal and recognizing the difficulties faced by both advocates and police in obtaining FIR copies, the then Chairman of HCLSC, Hon'ble Justice Maniampattu Vajiravelu Muralidaran, highlighted the importance of upholding fundamental rights guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. With the aim of adhering to the directives of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Youth Bar Association of India v. Union of India and Others (Writ Petition (Crl) No. 68 of 2016), the High Court Legal Services Committee, Manipur, proposed the implementation of displaying these directives uniformly across all police stations in the State. Furthermore, they recommended issuing an order to ensure compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforementioned case at every police station in the State. This recommendation was communicated through a letter dated 08/03/2021, with reference number HCM/LSC-2-2016/Estt./5416, addressed to the Director General of Police, Manipur.

It would here be relevant to observe that, Mr. B. Prem Sharma, advocate, who appears before this Court on behalf of the petitioner, has extracted in the petition the purported minutes; which are no doubt salutary; of the alleged meeting of the High Court Legal Services Committee, High Court of Manipur; without seeking any leave and without any reference to the date on which it was supposedly held.

We are constrained to deprecate this practice, inasmuch as, minutes of the Manipur High Court Legal Services Committee are sought to be put in the public domain as pleadings, without obtaining requisite permission and without proper and necessary particulars.

A perusal of the prayer clause, however, indicates that the petitioner *inter alia* seeks a direction to the official respondents to implement the directions

issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "**Youth Bar Association of India Vs. Union of India & Others**" reported in **(2016) 9 SCC 473**.

Needless to state that, the directions issued in **Youth Bar Association of India** (*supra*); as are all decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, *ipso jure* binding on all authorities, throughout the territory of India.

In this view of the matter, the official respondents are directed to comply with the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Youth Bar Association** of India (*supra*) scrupulously forthwith.

With a heavy heart, however, we are constrained to direct the removal of Mr. B. Prem Sharma from the panel of lawyers empaneled by the Manipur High Court Legal Services Committee, in view of his irresponsible conduct and further caution him not to initiate innumerable inchoate proceedings, dressed as Public Interest Litigation, before this Court in future.

No further direction is called for.

The present PIL is disposed of accordingly.

Sandeep

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE