

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

CRP(CRP Art. 227) No. 8 of 2024

Thoudam Indrakumar Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

Khumanthem Purnimashi Devi & ors.

... Respondents

With

MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227)) No. 15 of 2024

B E F O R E

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH

O R D E R

18-07-2024

Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks one week's time for supplying a copy of the review petition to the learned GA representing the SDO, Wangoi and also for filing an affidavit showing proof of service of notice to the other respondents.

Prayer is allowed.

List these cases again on 30-08-2024.

Registry is directed to reflect the name of Mr. Niranjana Sanasam, learned GA as counsel for the respondents in the cause list.

JUDGE

Devananda

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

MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227)) No. 32 of 2024

(Ref:- CRP(CRP Art. 227 No. 8 of 2024)

Nongthombam Beikul Singh

... Applicant

Vs.

Thoudam Indrakumar Singh & ors.

... Respondents

**B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH**

O R D E R

18-07-2024

Heard Mr. A. Viscount, learned counsel appearing for the applicant; Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel assisted by Syed Murtaza Ahmed, learned counsel appearing for the contesting respondents No. 1 and 2 (petitioner in the connected Review Petition) and Mr. Niranjana Sanasam, learned GA appearing for the respondent No. 3.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the applicant that the mutation order impugned in the connected revision petition was passed by the present applicant while he was acting as an SDO, Wangoi and at present, he has retired from service. The learned counsel further submitted that while challenging the said mutation order passed by the present applicant in his official capacity, there is no requirement in law for impleading the present applicant in his individual capacity and that impleadment of the present SDC, who is holding the office of the SDO, Wangoi, is only necessary. The learned counsel, accordingly, submitted that since the present applicant is not a necessary party, his name may be deleted from the array of parties in the connected revision petition.

Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel appearing for the contesting respondents No. 1 and 2 fairly submitted that he has no objection in allowing the present application filed by the applicant.

Mr. Niranjana Sanasam, learned GA appearing for the respondent No. 3 also endorsed the submission made by the counsel appearing for the respondents No. 1 and 2.

After hearing the submission advanced by the counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the record, this court is of the considered view that the impleadment of the present applicant as one of the respondents in the connected revision petition is not at all necessary as he is neither proper nor a necessary party.

Accordingly, the present application is allowed.

Registry is directed to delete the name of the present applicant from the array of parties in the connected revision petition.

JUDGE

Devananda

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

MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227)) No. 33 of 2024

**(Ref:- MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227)) No. 15 of 2024 &
CRP(CRP Art. 227 No. 8 of 2024)**

Nongthombam Beikul Singh

... Applicant

Vs.

Thoudam Indrakumar Singh & ors.

... Respondents

**B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH**

O R D E R

18-07-2024

Heard Mr. A. Viscount, learned counsel appearing for the applicant; Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel assisted by Syed Murtaza Ahmed, learned counsel appearing for the contesting respondents No. 1 and 2 (petitioner in the connected Revision Petition) and Mr. Niranjana Sanasam, learned GA appearing for the respondent No. 3.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the applicant that the mutation order impugned in the connected revision petition was passed by the present applicant while he was acting as an SDO, Wangoi and at present, he has retired from service. The learned counsel further submitted that while challenging the said mutation order passed by the present applicant in his official capacity, there is no requirement in law for impleading the present applicant in his individual capacity and that impleadment of the present SDC, who is holding the office of the SDO, Wangoi, is only necessary. The learned counsel, accordingly, submitted that since the present applicant is not a necessary party, his name may be deleted from the array of parties in the connected MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227) No. 15 of 2024.

Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel appearing for the contesting respondents No. 1 and 2 fairly submitted that he has no objection in allowing the present application filed by the applicant.

Mr. Niranjan Sanasam, learned GA appearing for the respondent No. 3 also endorsed the submission made by the counsel appearing for the respondents No. 1 and 2.

After hearing the submission advanced by the counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the record, this court is of the considered view that the impleadment of the present applicant as one of the respondents in the connected MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227) No. 15 of 2024 is not at all necessary as he is neither proper nor a necessary party.

Accordingly, the present application is allowed.

Registry is directed to delete the name of the present applicant from the array of parties in the connected MC(CRP(CRP Art. 227) No. 15 of 2024.

JUDGE

Devananda