

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

El. Pet. No. 8 of 2022

Md. Nasirruddin Khan

...***Petitioner/s***

Vrs.

Lourembam Rameshwor Meetei & 4 Ors

...***Respondent/s***

With

MC(El.Pet.) No. 52 of 2022

El. Recr. Pet. No. 10 of 2022

-B E F O R E-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH

16.03.2026

[1] Mr. N. Zequeson, learned counsel appeared for the respondent no. 1.

[2] By an order dated 31.08.2022 passed by this Court in El. Pet. No. 8 of 2022, the Election Petition has been proceeded ex-parte against respondent nos. 2 to 5.

[3] During the pendency of the Election Petition, an application registered as MC(El. Pet) No. 18 of 2025 was filed by the learned counsel appearing for the election petitioner with a prayer for allowing their determination as counsel for the Election Petitioner. By an order dated 18.12.2025 the said application was allowed and the counsel appearing for the election petitioner determined themselves from representing the Election Petitioner.

[4] It has been submitted by Mr. N. Zequeson that
consequent upon allowing the determination of the counsel

representing the Election petitioner, the Election Petitioner remain un-represented in all the proceedings subsequent to allowing the determination of the counsels representing the election petitioner.

[5] Today also when these matters are taken up, the election petitioner remain un-represented by anybody. In view of the above, the learned counsel for the respondent no. 1 in the said Election Petition prays for dismissing the Election Petition for non-prosecution.

[6] I have heard the submission advanced by the learned counsel representing the respondent no. 1 in Election Petition and the petitioner in the connected Election Recrimination Petition No. 10 of 2022.

[7] On perusal of the earlier proceeding in connection with the said Election Petition as recorded in the order sheet, it is ascertained that the election petitioner has been absent in all the subsequent proceeding after allowing of the determination of the counsel representing the election petitioner. In the case of ***Dr. P. Nalla Thampy Thera vs B.L. Shanker and Ors reported in 1984 (Supp) Supreme Court Cases 631*** it has been, inter alia, held by the Hon'ble Apex Court as under:-

"15. We proceed next to examine whether the election petition could be dismissed in the absence of the election petitioner and whether the appellant could apply for its restoration though he himself was not the election petitioner. The basis of the appellant's contention that the election petition cannot be dismissed for the

absence of the election petitioner is that once an election petition is filed, it concerns the entire constituency. Purity of the electoral process in a democracy, it is contended, is of paramount importance and an election petition cannot be permitted to be dismissed for default inasmuch as that would lead to situations brought about by manipulation, undue influence, fraud or winning over of the election petitioner. The second respondent's counsel has not disputed before us and rightly in our view that purity of the electoral process is paramount in a democracy and an election petition should not be permitted to be abandoned by undue influence or pressure over the election petitioner. It may be pointed out that there was no allegation of undue influence or pressure over the election petitioner to justify his conduct in this case. It is relevant to mention that the second respondent who was the elected candidate was expelled from the Lok Sabha in December 1978, and in August 1979, the Lok Sabha to which respondent 2 had been elected was dissolved. It was after these supervening events that in October 1979 the request to delete prayer (c) was made and the other orders followed. This explanation given by respondent 2's counsel to justify the conduct of the election petitioner is a relevant feature.

16. There is no support in the statute for the contention of the appellant that an election petition cannot be dismissed for default. The appellant contended that default of appearance or non-prosecution of the election petition must be treated as on par with withdrawal or abatement and, therefore, though there is no clear provision in the Act, the same principle should govern and the obligation to notify as provided in Section 110 or 116 of the Act should be made applicable. We see no justification to accept such a contention. Non-prosecution or abandonment is certainly not withdrawal. Withdrawal is a positive and voluntary act while non-prosecution or abandonment may not necessarily be an act of volition. It may spring from negligence, indifference, inaction or even incapacity or inability to prosecute. In the case of withdrawal steps are envisaged to be taken before the Court in accordance with the prescribed procedure. In the case of non-prosecution or abandonment, the election petitioner does not appear before the Court and obtain any orders. We have already indicated that the Act is a self-contained statute strictly laying down its own procedure and nothing can be read in it which is not there nor can its provisions be enlarged or extended by analogy. In fact, the terms of Section 87 of the Act clearly prescribe that if there be no provision in the Act to the contrary, the provisions of the Code would apply and that would include Order 9, Rule 8 of the Code, under which an election petition would be liable to be dismissed if the election petitioner does not appear to prosecute the election petition.

17. In many cases it has been held that an election petition can be dismissed for default. A Full Bench of the Punjab High Court in *Jugal Kishore v. Dr. Baldev Parkash*, had occasion to consider this question when Grover, J. delivering the judgment of the Court spoke thus:

It has been repeatedly said that an election petition once filed is not a contest only between the parties thereto but continues for the benefit of the whole constituency. It is for that purpose that in the Representation of the People Act, 1951, provisions have been made in Sections 109 and 110 relating to withdrawal of an election petition and Sections 112 and 116 relating to abatement of such a petition the effect of which is that the petition cannot come to an end by the withdrawal thereof by the death of the petitioner or by the death or withdrawal of opposition by the respondent, but is liable in such cases to be continued by any person who might have been a petitioner. There is nothing in the entire Act providing or indicating that a similar procedure is to be followed in the event of a petitioner failing to prosecute the petition. Such failure can be due to various causes. The petitioner can, by force of circumstances, be genuinely rendered helpless to prosecute the petition. For instance, he may find that his financial condition has suddenly worsened and that he can no longer afford the expenses of litigation. He may even, owing to exigencies of business or vocation or profession, have to go to such a distant place from the seat of the High Court where the election petition is being tried that he may find it impossible to prosecute the petition in a proper manner. There would be two courses open to him and that will depend entirely on his volition. He can either file an application for withdrawal of the petition disclosing the circumstances which have brought about such a situation in which case there would be no difficulty in following the procedure laid down in Sections 109 and 110 of the Act, or he may choose to simply absent himself from the Court or cease to give any instructions to the counsel engaged by him or fail to deposit the process-fee and the diet-money for witnesses or take the necessary steps for summoning the witnesses in which case the Court will have no option but to dismiss the election petition under the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure which would be applicable to the election petitions in the absence of any express provisions in the Act. The dismissal will have to be under the provisions contained in Order 9 or Order 17 of the Code.

It is quite clear that there is no distinct provision in the Act laying down any particular or special procedure which is to be followed when the petitioner chooses to commit default either in appearance or in production of evidence or

generally in prosecuting the petition. The provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure would, therefore, be applicable under Section 87 of the Act. I am further of the opinion that any argument which could be pressed and was adopted for saying that the inherent powers of the Court could not be exercised in such circumstances would be of no avail now as the High Court is a Court of Record and possesses all the inherent powers of a court while trying election petitions.

It is relevant to note the observations of Hidayatullah, C.J. in Sunderlal Mannalal v. Nandramdas Dwarkadas, where he indicated: (AIR p. 261, para 5)

Now the Act does not give any power of dismissal. But it is axiomatic that no court or tribunal is supposed to continue a proceeding before it when the party who has moved it has not appeared nor cared to remain present. The dismissal, therefore, is an inherent power which every tribunal possesses...

18. Similar view has been expressed by another Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court in Duryodhan v. Sitaram. A four-Judge Bench of this Court in Rajendra Kumari Bajpai v. Ram Adhar Yadav, referred to the Punjab case. Fazal Ali, J. speaking on behalf of the Court quoted a portion of the judgment of Grover, J. which we have cited above and said: (SCC p. 453, para 10)

We fully approve of the line of reasoning adopted by the High Court in that case.

It, therefore, follows that the Code is applicable in disposing of an election petition when the election petitioner does not appear or take steps to prosecute the election petition. Dismissal of an election petition for default of appearance of the petitioner under the provisions of either Order IX or Order XVII of the Code would, therefore, be valid and would not be open to challenge on the ground that these provisions providing for dismissal of the election petition for default do not apply."

[8] In the said judgment, the Hon'ble Apex Court has categorically held that the Election Petition can be dismissed for non-prosecution as provided under Order IX or Order XVII of the CPC.

[9] In view of the failure on the part of the Election Petitioner to prosecute the Election Petition and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Dr. P. Nalla Thampy Thera vs B.L. Shanker and Ors reported in 1984 Supreme Court Cases 631 (Supra)***, this court is of the considered view that there is force and substance in the submission advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent no. 1 in the Election Petition. Accordingly, the Election Petition is hereby dismissed for non-prosecution.

[10] Mr. N. Zequeson, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in the Election Recrimination Petition No. 10 of 2022 submitted that as the connected Election Petition No. 8 of 2022 has been dismissed for non-prosecution, the learned counsel submitted that he did not want to press the said Election Recrimination Petition as well connected the MC(EI. Pet.) No. 52 of 2022.

[11] In view of the submission made by the learned counsel, the EI. Recr. Pet. No. 10 of 2022 and MC(EI. Pet.) No. 52 of 2022 are hereby dismissed as not pressed.

JUDGE

Lucy