

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

MC[CONT. CAS(C)] No. 16 of 2026

Phurailatpam Vivekananda Sharma

... Petitioner

- Versus -

Vineet Joshi & 8 Ors.

... Respondents

B E F O R E
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA

O R D E R
[M. Sundar, CJ]

18.05.2026

[1] Captioned 'Miscellaneous Case' ('MC' for the sake of convenience) has been taken out by contempt petitioners in main contempt petition seeking an amendment *qua* main contempt petition.

[2] Mr. Ng. Jotindra, learned counsel for MC applicants is before this Court on the Video Conferencing (VC) platform.

[3] As regards respondents, Ms. M. Nikita, learned counsel led by Mr. M. Rarry, learned senior advocate for all respondents except 'respondent No. 6' ('R-6' for the sake of convenience) is before this Court (Physical Court). As regards 'respondent No. 6' ('R-6' for the sake of

convenience) {Private respondent}, Mr. Juno Rahman, learned counsel led by Mr. M. Hemchandra, learned senior advocate is before this Court (Physical Court).

[4] A careful perusal of the MC application brings to light that the then Chief Secretary, Manipur was arrayed as R-1 when the contempt petition was presented in this Court on 13.07.2024. Thereafter, there was a change of incumbent *qua* office of Chief Secretary, owing to which contempt petitioner took out an impleadment application being MC[CONT.CAS(C)] No. 3 of 2025 and the same was allowed *vide* a judicial order dated 07.03.2025. There is no disputation or contestation before this Court that this judicial order dated 07.03.2025 made in MC[CONT. CAS(C)] No. 3 of 2025 has attained finality and has been given legal quietus. Now, this captioned MC has been taken out as there is a further change of incumbent *qua* office of Chief Secretary. In this view of the matter, the prayer is innocuous and the respondent Nos. 1 to 5 and 7 to 8 can obviously have no opposition, having been given legal quietus to earlier judicial order dated 07.03.2025 made in MC[CONT. CAS(C)] No. 3 of 2025.

[5] As regards R-6, Mr. M. Hemchandra, learned senior advocate on instructions from Mr. Juno Rahman, learned counsel, very fairly submits that he has no say as regards MC application is concerned and he will make submissions in the main contempt petition.

[6] As regards R-1 to R – 5 as well as R – 7 and R – 8, though obvious, we make it clear that all rights and contentions of the respondents remain preserved for being raised in the main contempt petition untrammelled by instant order in the captioned MC.

[7] In the light of narrative, discussion and dispositive reasoning as set out supra, captioned MC application is ordered as prayed for albeit with preservation of rights and contentions of both sides in the aforesaid manner. It is also made clear that all the rights and contentions of contempt petitioner also remain preserved. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Bipin

P.S. : Registry to carry out necessary and consequential amendment in the case file within a fortnight from today i.e., on or before 01.06.2026.