

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

MC(WP(C))No.394 of 2026

With

MC(WP(C))No.395 of 2026

Shri Sagolsem Aboi Yaiphaba, aged about 31 years old, S/o
Sagolsem Dhiren Singh of Langol Ningthou Leikai, PO & PS
Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795004
(Recommended as MTS) & **29 Ors.**

Applicants

Vs.

Wangkhem Ranjan Singh, S/o Wangkhem Binoy Singh, aged
about 25 years a resident of Ningomthong Sairom Leirak, PO
Singjamei, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-
795008 & **4 Ors.**

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 Mr. M. Sundar, CJ)

25.05.2026

[1] This common order will now dispose of the captioned
2(two) 'Miscellaneous Cases' ('MCs' for the sake of convenience and
brevity) which have been filed with prayers seeking to implead the MC
applicants as parties to the main writ petition wherein selection to
various posts in Manipur University has been assailed.

[2] Mr. H.S. Paonam, learned senior advocate instructed by Ms. Harichhaya Chanu, learned counsel on record for MC applicants in MC(WP(C))No.394 of 2026 and Mr. A. Mohendro, learned counsel on record for MC applicants in MC(WP(C))No.395 of 2026 are before this Court (physical Court). Mr. Keisham. Kishan Singh, learned counsel on record for respondent Nos. 1 & 2, Mr. B.P. Sahu, learned senior advocate instructed by Abhishek P Sahu, learned counsel on record along with Mr. Kh. Tarunkumar, learned senior advocate instructed by Ms. Kh. Maria, learned counsel on record for respondent No.3, Mr. S. Vijayanand Sharma, learned Senior Panel Counsel for Central Government (Sr. PCCG) for respondent No.4 and Mr. S. Jasobanta, learned counsel on record for respondent No.5 are before this Court (physical Court).

[3] As regards writ petitioners, Mr. Keisham Kishan Singh, learned counsel on record for writ petitioners is before this Court (physical Court).

[4] This Court pointed out that mere selection does not confer any right on a selectee until appointed. This obtaining position of law is not disputed by any of the counsel before this Court including MC applicants.

[5] Be that as it may, considering the nature of the matter, facts and circumstances of the case and also taking into account the submissions of learned counsel for MC applicants that MC applicants

have been issued offer letters (we express no opinion on this point in this order), by consent of all the afore-referred counsel before us, we write that the MC applicants shall be heard as intervenors without impleading them as parties to the writ petition.

[6] Though obvious, for the sake of specificity it is clarified that this means that MC applicants will now have audience but it starts and ends there.

[7] Registry to show the names of counsel for MC applicants describing them as ‘intervenors’ in the cause title and cause list.

[8] Captioned MCs are given a closure and are disposed of in the aforesaid manner. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

John Kom