

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

WP(C) No. 485 of 2025

1. Mr. Laishram Surjit Singh, aged about 53 years, S/o L. Ibohalmacha Singh of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur;
2. Mr. Huidrom Pradeepkumar Singh, aged about 54 years, S/o (L) H. Mani Singh of Wangkhei Thangjam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
3. Md. Sirajuddin, aged about 51 years, S/o Md. Naseruddin of Santhel Awang Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Mayang Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur.
4. Mr. Karam Ranjan Singh, aged about 56 years, W/o (L) Karam Mangi Singh of Kongpal Mutum Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
5. Mr. Elangbam Basanta Singh, aged about 53 years, S/o (L) Elangbam Maipak Singh of Wangkhei Ayangpali, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
6. Mr. Thounaojam Raghumani Singh, aged about 57 years, S/o (L) Th. Singhajit Singh of Nongmeibung Nambam Chuthek Bazar, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
7. Mr. Telem Ranjan Meitei, aged about 55 years S/o (L) T. Thambal Meitei of Wangkhei Ningthem Pukhri Mapal, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
8. Mr. Shijagurumayum Romesh Sharma, aged about 58 years, S/o (L) Sh. Kunjabihari Sharma of Brahmapur Aribam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
9. Mr. Thangjam Norenjit Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o (L) Th. Jilla Singh of Wangkhei Thangjam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.
10. Mr. Athokpam Indramani Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o A. Dwijamani Singh of Wangkhei Ningthem Pukhri Mapal, P.O. P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
11. Mr. Laishangbam Okey Singh, aged about 57 S/o (L) L. Dinamani Singh, Keishamthong Hodam Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur;
12. Mr. Yumnam Shyamchand Singh, aged about 51 years, S/o (L) Yumnam Thambalngou Singh of Keishamthong Maning Langjam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur;

13. Mr. Athokpam Robindro Singh, aged about 59 years S/o (L) Athokpam Irabot Singh of Wangkhei Ningthem Pukhri Mapal, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;
14. Mr. Laishram Bijando Singh, aged about 54 years, S/o (L) L. Komla Singh of Kangla Siphai, P.O. Porompat, P.S. Lamlai, Imphal East District, Manipur;
15. Mr. Sanjrambam Herabee Singh, aged about 56 years, S/o (L) Sanjrambam Ram Singh of Nongdam Awang Leikai, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Lamlai, Imphal East District, Manipur;
16. Mr. Maibam Joychandra Singh, aged about 50 years, S/o (L) Maibam Ibohi Singh of Wangkhei Yonglan Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur
17. Mr. Sarangthem Achouba Singh, aged about 53 years, S/o (L) S. Biramangol Singh of Kongba Chanam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur and;
18. Ms. Ningthoujam Manglembi Devi, aged about 57 years, D/o N. Yaima Singh of Phayeng Sabal Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Lamsang, Imphal West District, Manipur.

.....Petitioner/s

-Versus-

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Principal Secretary/Commissioner/Resource), Government Secretary (Land of Manipur, New Secretariat Building, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur-795001;
2. The Principal Secretary/ Commissioner/ Secretary (DP) Government of Manipur, Imphal Old Secretariat Building, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur-795001 and
3. The Principal Secretary/ Commissioner/ Secretary (Finance) Government of Manipur, Imphal Old Secretariat Building, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur-795001.

....Respondent/s

**BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

Order (Oral)

22.05.2026

[1] Present Mr. NG. Jotindra, learned counsel appearing through VC along with Ms. W. Geetarani, learned counsel appearing physically for the petitioners and Mr. Shyam Sharma, learned G.A. for the State respondents.

[2] By the present petition, the petitioners who are 18 (eighteen) in numbers pray for quashing the impugned order dated 01.04.2025 issued by the Secretary, Land Resources Department, Government of Manipur whereby regularizing the services of 21 (twenty one) employees of the department (Mandal, Process Server and Draughtsman) with effect from 31.12.2013 on the ground that their pay and allowances for the period w.e.f. 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 were denied, as the adhoc services of 21 employees were not officially extended by the department. The 18 petitioners are included among 21 employees regularized by the impugned order dated 01.04.2025.

[3] It is the case of the petitioners that even though their services were not extended officially, however by issuing various orders (Annexure-A/14 Colly) issued by the Head of Department/Higher Officials of the Land Resources Department, they have discharged their duties and engaged in various assignments for the electoral process and others. As such, it is submitted that pay and allowances for the period from 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 cannot be denied to them.

[4] The prayer in the writ petition is reproduced herein below:

- “i) to issue a writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order to quash the impugned order dated 01.04.2025 (Annexure-A\25) issued by the Secretary, Land Resources Department, Government of Manipur forthwith as arbitrary, malafide and unconstitutional;
- ii) to issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other the appropriate writ, order or direction directing respondents to pay the due pay and allowances of the petitioners for the period from 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 for working as Mandal, Process Server and Draughtsman in Revenue Department, Manipur as was done in case of the many similarly situated persons;
- iii) to direct the respondents for heavy costs and;

- iv) to pass any further order or orders as to the Hon'ble Court many seem fit and proper for the ends of justice and equity.

[5] During the course of hearing, Mr. NG. Jotindra, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the petitioners are limiting the challenge to the impugned order dated 01.04.2025 confined to the denial of pay and allowances for the period from 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that similarly situated persons, whose services were regularized with effect from 31.12.2013 but denied pay and allowances for the period from 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 for non-extension of services, approached this Court by way of writ petition being WP(C) No. 689 of 2022 [Mr. Khangembam Jayanta Singh & 2 Ors. –vs- State of Manipur & Anr.]

[6] Vide judgment and order dated 28.11.2025, this Court held that since the services of the petitioners therein were regularized by the department and their services were utilized for the period from 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013, direction was issued to the State respondent to release pay and allowances for this period.

[7] Mr. NG. Jotindra, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the present case is also similar to the judgment and order dated 28.11.2025 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 689 of 2022 and similar direction may be issued.

[8] Mr. Shyam Sharma, learned G.A. for the State respondent, fairly concedes that the present matter is squarely covered by the judgment and order dated 28.11.2025 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 689 of 2022 and in this respect, the State respondent has filed supplementary affidavit dated 27.04.2026 and in para 2 of the affidavit, it is clearly stated that the present case is covered by the judgment and order dated 28.11.2025 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 689 of 2022 and submitted that this Court may pass appropriate order.

[9] This Court has perused the materials on record and especially, the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners and supplementary affidavit of respondent No. 1 to the effect that the present case is squarely covered by the judgment and order dated 28.11.2025

passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 689 of 2022. It is admitted case that there was no formal extension of the services of the petitioners in both cases for the period from 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013. However, their services were utilized by the department on the basis of written order issued by the Higher Officials and thereafter, the petitioners were attending office and they had performed duties throughout till their regularization on 31.12.2013.

[10] It may be appropriate to reproduce the relevant paras from the judgment and order dated 28.11.2025 in WP(C) No. 689 of 2022:

"[9] This Court has perused the materials on record, the submissions made at the bar and law in this regard. The short question arose in the present petition is

"Whether the employees whose ad-hoc service has not been extended, are entitled to remuneration for the period which their services have been utilized by the employer?"

[10] From the pleadings of the parties, the following facts are admitted:

(i) The petitioners were appointed on ad-hoc basis vide orders dated 29.08.1997 and 23.12.1997.

(ii) Their ad-hoc services were extended from time to time.

(iii) As seen from order dated 26.10.2010 [Annexure-A/8] issued by the Commissioner (Revenue), Govt. of Manipur, services of 124 ad-hoc employees of the departments were extended post facto for the period w.e.f 01.09.2008 to 31.08.2010 for a period of 24 months. This shows that there has been practice of post facto extension of ad-hoc service for a bulk period.

(iv) There has not been any official extension of ad-hoc service for the period wef 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 till the date of prospective regularisation vide order dated 31.12.2013. However, there are various orders issued by SDCS/SDOs for utilisation of the services of the petitioners and other similarly employees during the period wef 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 in various assignments as seen from orders annexed as Annexure-A/9 series. Such orders are not denied by the respondents, except for the plea that the officers issuing such orders are not competent to extend the ad-hoc services.

(v) *The ad-hoc services of the petitioners and others were regularized vide orders dated 31.12.2013 with immediate effect.*

vi) *By the impugned order dated 20.09.2021, the remuneration for the period wef 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 has been denied to the petitioners on ground of non-extension of ad-hoc service for this period.*

(vii) *OM dated 03.10.2013 issued by the Government of Manipur for one time regularisation of 288 direct recruit ad-hoc employees in various departments pre-supposes 'serving on ad-hoc basis continuously from 23.03.2006 onwards'.*

(viii) *The ad-hoc services of the petitioners and similarly situated persons, were regularised wef 31.12.2013 under the OM dated 03.12.2013 on the basis of recommendation of a duly constituted special DPC.*

[11] *This Court is of the view that the petitioners are entitled to remuneration for the period wef 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 during which period their services were utilised and/or extracted by the respondents on the basis of specific orders, notwithstanding issuance of any formal order of extension of ad-hoc services. It is further held that regularisation of the ad-hoc service prospectively vide order dated 31.12.2013 will amount to implied extension of ad-hoc services of the petitioners for the period w.e.f 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 in view of the clear mandate of the OM dated 03.10.2013 which presupposes continuing service on ad-hoc basis since 23.03.2006 [as observed in Para 10(vii) above]. Respondents are directed to release the due remunerations of the petitioners for the period w.e.f. 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.*

[12] *Writ petition is allowed and is disposed of in terms of directions and observations in para 11 above. No cost.*

[13] *Send a copy of this order to the Administrative Secretary (Revenue, now Land Resource), Govt. of Manipur for information and necessary compliance."*

[11] In view of the above, writ petition is disposed of by directing the State respondent to release pay and allowances applicable to the petitioners for the period from 01.09.2010 to 30.12.2013 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

[12] Send a copy of this order to the Administrative Secretary (Revenue, now Land Resource), Govt. of Manipur for information and necessary compliance.

JUDGE

Kh. Joshua Maring

**KH.
JOSHUA
MARING**

Digitally signed
by KH. JOSHUA
MARING
Date:
2026.05.25
11:27:31 +05'30'