

SHOUGRAKPAM
DEVANANDA
SINGH

Digitally signed by
SHOUGRAKPAM
DEVANANDA SINGH
Date: 2025.03.04 15:49:27
+05'30'

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

WP(C) No. 664 of 2022

Pukhrambam Jyoti Devi

... Petitioner

Vs.

Manipur Public Service Commission & ors.

... Respondents

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

O R D E R

04-03-2025

Ms. P. Jyoti, the petitioner appearing in person submitted that she was earlier represented by Mr. Ajoy Pebam as her counsel, however, she has obtained a No Objection Certificate from her counsel and that she desires to appear in person. The petitioner, accordingly, seek leave to let her appear in person to conduct this case.

Leave is granted.

As prayed for by the petitioner, list this case again on 01-04-2025 so as to enable her to file a recast petition in terms of the order passed today in MC(WP(C)) No. 111 of 2024 and a copy of the same be furnished to the learned counsel appearing for the respondents.

JUDGE

Devananda

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

MC(WP(C)) No. 111 of 2024

(Ref:- WP(C) No. 664 of 2022)

Pukhrambam Jyoti Devi

... Applicant

Vs.

State of Manipur & ors.

... Respondents

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

O R D E R

04-03-2025

Heard Ms. P. Jyoti, the applicant appearing in person; Mrs. O. Momota, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. Suman, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 1 and Mr. M. Rarry, learned senior counsel assisted by Ms. Nikita, learned counsel appearing for the respondents No. 2 to 6.

The present application has been filed with the prayer for allowing the petitioner to amend the pleadings made in her writ petition being WP(C) No. 664 of 2024 as proposed at para 5 of the present application.

Mrs. O. Momota, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent No. 1 raised strong objection on the ground that the proposed pleadings are not matter of facts and it pertains to law points only and if such amendment are allowed, it will change the nature and issues of the original writ petition. Mr. M. Rarry, learned senior counsel, however, fairly submitted that he has no strong objection with regard to the prayer for amendment, however, he endorsed the submission made by Mrs. O. Momota, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 1.

I have perused and carefully examined the proposed amendment made in para 5 of the present application. On careful examination of the pleadings which the petitioner wants to incorporate in her writ petition, this court finds that all the averments made by the petitioner as proposed amendments pertains to facts which arose or which comes to the knowledge of the petitioner after filing of the writ petition and the amendment sought for in the prayer portion relates to challenging the appointment order subsequent upon the DPC impugned in the original writ petition. Since the subsequent appointment order can be challenged by the present petitioner by filing another writ petition, this court is of the considered view that in order to avoid multiplicity of litigation, it will be in the interest of justice to allow the present application, since the proposed amendment pertains to the same subject matter and that the nature and the issue raised in the present writ petition will not be changed.

In view of the above, the present amendment application is allowed. Petitioner is directed to file a recast of the writ petition by incorporating the proposed amendment within a period of one week from today.

With the aforesaid direction, the present application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Devananda