

Sl. No. 1**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL****MC(Review.Pet.) No. 13 of 2025**

Laishram Nabakumar Singh and 9 others

Applicants**Vs.**

State of Manipur and 8 others

Respondents

BEFORE

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.GUNESHWAR SHARMA****ORDER*****(Order of the court was made by M. Sundar, CJ)*****07.11.2025**

[1] Captioned Misc. case has been filed by 10 (ten) individuals seeking leave to file third party review qua an order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. No. 11 of 2024.

[2] Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, learned senior advocate instructed by Mr. W. Sanatomba Meitei, learned counsel on record for the applicants submits that the petitioners were members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads in State of Manipur, having been appointed either by the State Government or pursuant to an interim order dated 29.02.2024 made in a Misc. case in W.A. No. 11 of 2024 and/or are orders in other Misc. cases in connected appeals being W.A. Nos. 9 and 10 of 2024.

[3] In the normal circumstances, grant of leave to a third party to seek review of a judicial order of a court is matter between the court and the petitioners seeking leave but in the instant case, considering the nature of the matter which involves larger public interest, this court issued notice to the respondents on 26.09.2025.

[4] Post issue of notice, today, Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State counsel has entered appearance on behalf of R1 to R3 and Ms. Th. Lekhakumari, learned counsel, has entered appearance on behalf the R4 to R9. Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Advocate General and senior counsel appears on behalf of Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, learned State Counsel as regards R1 to R3 and Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior advocate appears on behalf Ms. Lekhakumari for R4 to R9.

[5] At the outset, Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei very fairly submitted that the petitioners in the captioned Misc. case accept the verdict dated 29.08.2025 which is a common order in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 but they are seeking very limited review as regards ongoing works pertaining to civic amenities. This submission of the learned senior counsel made on instructions from the counsel on record is recorded.

[6] As regards the respondents, learned Advocate General very fairly submitted that the constitutional right of the petitioners to seek limited review as above cannot be curtailed or stifled and that the State itself has already filed a review petition but review petition of State is not limited and it is a full-fledged review.

[7] As regards private respondents, senior advocate Mr. HS Paonam submitted that other members of Administrative Committees of various Gram Panchayats and Administrators of various Zilla Parishads were before the court when the Division Bench rendered the common order dated 29.08.2025 in W.A. Nos. 9, 10 and 11 of 2024 and therefore, the petitioners cannot now be heard to contend that review is necessary.

[8] We carefully considered the submissions made on both sides. We find that the fair submission made by learned senior counsel for petitioners that what is sought is not a full-fledged review and only a limited review and that too limited to civic amenities for which work is in progress as larger public interest comes into play, we deem it appropriate to allow the captioned misc. case but with a rider that only a limited review as projected by the petitioner will be heard out, obviously, on its own merits and in accordance with law.

[9] Captioned Misc. case ordered/disposed of in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sushil

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE