

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

**MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.69 of 2025
With
CRP(CRP Art.227) No.29 of 2025
With
MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.39 of 2025
With
MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.45 of 2025
With
MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.67 of 2025**

Radha Krishna and 5 Ors.

Petitioner/s

Vs.

Vinod Kumar Sharma and 2 Ors.

Respondent/s

BEFORE
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. KEMPAIAH SOMASHEKAR

(ORDER)

02.09.2025.

The learned counsel for the petitioner namely Mr. Anjan Prasad Sahu in MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.69 of 2025 is present before the Court physically but the learned counsel namely Mr. Sarvan Kumar is also present through video conferencing.

The aforesaid proceeding is connected with item Nos. 28, 29, 30 & 31 i.e., CRP(CRP Art.227) No.29 of 2025, MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.39 of 2025, MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.45 of 2025 and MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.67 of

2025 whereas Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned senior counsel for the respondent No.1 in MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.45 of 2025 whereby represented by Mr. A. Golly, learned counsel for the respondent who is on record also present before the Court physically.

However, the learned senior counsel Mr. N. Ibotombi in this matter submitted that learned counsel Mr. Sarvan kumar who is appearing through video conferencing whereby he has filed Vakalatnama on behalf of the caveator but the signature of the parties, it is placed only one person and this submission which is made by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, Mr. N. Ibotombi in CRP(CRP Art.227) No.29 of 2025 and this submission made by the aforesaid learned counsel is taken on record. Therefore, the learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner, Mr. Sarvan Kumar who is appearing through video conferencing and inclusive of Mr. A. P Sahu, learned counsel who is also present before the Court physically be directed to clarify even the signature of the parties in Vakalatnama only one person's signature is placed but the remaining persons' signature are not found. Therefore, it is deemed appropriate that referring the provision of order 1 rule 8 of C. P.C. In case, it is representative capacity however the issue in between the petitioners and respondents is relating to the temple

which is indicating the material available on record and therefore, the aforesaid counsels be directed to clarify the status relating to the Vakalatnama and also relating to one more person, in case they are going to intend to participate in this proceeding.

Accordingly, made an observation.

Whereas proceeding in MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.69 of 2025 and this proceeding has initiated by the applicant/petitioner seeking for early hearing in which Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned senior counsel is present for the respondent. Once the connected matters are listed for hearing, there is no consequence to consider this miscellaneous case seeking for early hearing.

Therefore, this Misc.case i.e., MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.69 of 2025 proceeding stands disposed of.

Consequently, keeping in the view the proceeding in Item No.27 i.e., MC(CRP(CRP Art.227) No.69 of 2025, the item Nos. 28,29,30 & 31 i.e., CRP(CRP Art.227) No.29 of 2025, MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.39 of 2025, MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.45 of 2025 and MC(CRP(CRP Art.227)) No.67 of 2025 would be listed on 18.09.2025.

Ab. Surjit

CHIEF JUSTICE

