

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

WP(C) No. 855 of 2023

1. Sukham Bidananda Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o. S. Raghumani Singh, residence of Lilong Arapati Makha Leikai, P.O & P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795130.
2. Naroibam Dhanajit Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o. Naoroibam Budhichandra Singh, residence of Iroisemba Amukhong Leirak, P.O & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795004.
3. Yanglem Surendrajit Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o. Yanglem Sharat Singh, residence of Shamurou Awang Leikai, P.O & P.S. Wangoi, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795009.
 - [Petitioner No. 3 has been deleted from the cause title vide order dated 13.02.2024 passed in MC(WP(C)) No. 108 of 2025]
4. Khumukcham Munilal Singh, aged about 36 years, Kh. Agamba Singh, residence of Kakching Khunou Thingnam Tarung Leikai, P.O Kakching P.S. Waikhong, Kakching District, Manipur – 795103.

...Petitioner/s

Vrs.

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Addl. Chief Secretary/Secretary (Forest, Environment & Climate Change), Government of Manipur, at new secretariat,

- old Building, South Block, Babupara, P.O & P.S.
Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Deputy Secretary (Forest, Environment & Climate Change), Government of Manipur, Secretariate, P.O & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Principal Chief Conservator of Forest & Head of Forest Force, Forest Department, Government of Manipur, Imphal East District, Manipur – 795001.
4. The Chairman, Enquiry Committee/Addl. PCCF & OSD & OSD (Forest & Env't.) & Principal Secretary (YAS), Government of Manipur– 795001.

...Respondent/s

-B E F O R E-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH

For the petitioners : Mr. Kh. Tarunkumar, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Rustam, Advocate

For the respondents: Mr. Lenin Hijam, Sr. Advocate & AG
Ms. Thanyomi Keishing, Advocate

Date of hearing : **30.05.2026.**

Date of order : **30.05.2026.**

(O R D E R)

[1] Mr. Kh. Tarunkumar, learned Sr. counsel assisted by Mr. Rustam, learned counsel appeared on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Lenin Hijam, learned Sr. counsel and learned AG assisted

by Mr. Thanyomi Keishing, learned counsel appeared on behalf of the respondents.

[2] The present writ petition has been filed with a prayer for quashing and setting aside the impugned advertisement No. 1/2023 dated 04.12.2023. Under the said impugned advertisement, 70 post of Forest Guards were advertised for appointment on contract basis.

[3] It has been submitted at the Bar that initially the respondents issued advertisement No. 1/ 2019 dated 25.01.2019 notifying 50 post of Forest Guards for appointment on temporary basis by Direct Recruitment. Subsequently, an addendum to the said advertisement dated 02.02.2019 was issued increasing the number of advertise post from 50 to 70. Later on, after the recruitment process pursuant to the said advertisement was over, the authorities issued an order dated 23.08.2023 cancelling the recruitment examination held on 16.02.2023 in respect of 70 post of Forest Guards.

[4] It has been submitted by the learned AG that the impugned advertisement dated 04.12.2023 notifying 70 Post of Forest Guards for appointment on contract basis is totally different from the earlier 70 post of Forest Guards advertised in 2019 which is to be filled up by way of regular appointment. The learned AG

accordingly submitted that the petitioners have no locus to challenged the said impugned advertisement as the grievances of the petitioners is against cancellation of the 70 advertised posts and the examination process for recruitment of Forest Guards on regular basis. Accordingly, the learned AG submitted that the present writ petition can be closed.

[5] Mr. Kh. Tarunkumar, learned Sr. counsel appearing for the petitioners fairly submitted that the grievances of the petitioners are against cancellation of the examination in respect of 70 post of Forest Guards for appointment on regular basis. The learned counsel further submitted that as the advertisement dated 04.12.2023 impugned in the present writ petition is in respect of contract appointment, the petitioners have no grievances again it. Accordingly, the learned Sr. counsel submitted that the present writ petition can be closed.

[6] Recording the submission made by the Sr. learned counsel appearing for the parties, the present writ petition is hereby closed.

JUDGE

Lucy