

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

MC(WA) No. 22 of 2025

Yumlembam Surjit Singh

... Applicant

- Versus -

Manipur Public Service Commission & 2 Ors.

... Respondents

B E F O R E

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. K. SOMASHEKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

O R D E R

[K. Somashekar, CJ]

27.08.2025

This application proceeding is initiated by the applicant being a third party whereby seeking for leave to prefer an appeal relating to order rendered by the Ld. Single Judge on the writ side by passing a common judgment and order dated 02.05.2022 in W.P.(C) No. 375 of 2019 and its batches.

Learned counsel for the applicant, Mr. Keisham Kishan is present before this Court. Learned senior counsel for the respondents, Mr. M. Rarry is present before this Court physically.

Whereas, in this application, the applicant is seeking for leave to prefer an appeal which is indicated in the office noting but, the applicant was not a party in the proceeding of W.P.(C) No. 375 of 2019, in which the impugned judgment and order has been rendered by the Ld. Single Judge which is detrimental as it is passed in violation of Chapter IV Para/Rule 3 (1) e of Manipur High Court Rules, 2019.

It is further contended that the impugned order was rendered without hearing the appellant/applicant and also similar matter challenging the said rules which has already been admitted and passed order with the direction by the Ld. Co-ordinate Bench in W.P.(C) No. 312 of 2022 as clearly directed in its order dated 11.05.2022. This contentious contention has been taken by the learned counsel for the applicant whereby seeking for leave to prefer an appeal which is stated supra.

On the contrary, the learned senior counsel, Mr. M. Rarry is submitting that even though the order has been rendered by the Ld. Single Judge in W.P.(C) No. 375 of 2019, the applicant was not made a party to the proceeding and therefore, it needs not to prefer appeal. On this only premises, the said learned senior counsel is seeking for dismissing the the application. It is further contended that the petitioner in the original writ petition whereby common order has been rendered, they have not preferred any appeal relating to the impugned order which has been rendered by the Ld. Single Judge on the writ side in common order which his indicated herein.

However, keeping in view of the reasons stated in the application and in view of the submission made by the learned counsel for the applicant who is seeking for leave to prefer an appeal and even though he was not made a party in the writ proceeding, the application does not have any substance for granting leave as sought for.

Consequently, the present application stands dismissed.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Bipin