

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

WP(C) No. 895 of 2024

Loitongbam Ravichandra Singh

.....Petitioner/s

-Versus-

State of Manipur & 2 Ors.

....Respondent/s

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA

Order

16.06.2026

[1] Heard Mr. Th. Khagemba, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. S. Niranjana, learned G.A. for the State respondent.

[2] The petitioner appeared in the recruitment of Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police (Male/Civil) in the Manipur Police Department in terms of the advertisement issued in the year 2010. However, the name of the petitioner was included in lists of not-qualified candidates (Annexure-P/1) and his name appeared at serial No. 43 with total mark of 45.

[3] It is the case of the State respondent that: the petitioner belongs to unreserved (UR) candidate, the cut off mark for the UR was 51 and the petitioner was not considered as he could not secure 51 marks. The representation of the petitioner was rejected by the impugned order dated 20.11.2024 issued by the Commissioner (Home), Government of Manipur on the ground that the petitioner could not secure 51 marks fixed for the UR category. Para 4 of the order dated 20.11.2024 is reproduced as:

“4. And whereas, the Administrative Department after due consideration and minute examination of the representations submitted by the petitioner including the representation dated 16-11-2023 as well as the relevant records of the petitioner, it is found that he had failed to obtain the qualifying marks. His score is less than the last selected candidate in General Category (UR) i.e, 51 marks.

[4] Mr. Th. Khagemba, learned counsel for the petitioner, draws the attention of this Court to the judgment and order dated 16.06.2025 passed by this Court in WP(C) No. 1110 of 2022 (Annexure-R/3 in the rejoinder affidavit) whereby, in similar circumstances, this Court has rejected the plea of the State Government in the same recruitment that the cut off mark for UR candidate is 51 and directed the respondents to determine the cut off mark for UR and consider the case of the petitioner therein who secured 40 marks. The relevant para 31 of the judgment and order dated 16.06.2025 is reproduced as:

“41. In the circumstances, the impugned order dated 07.10.2022 passed by the respondent No.2 is set aside with a direction first to decide the cut-off mark for UR candidates in the recruitment of the Assistant Sub Inspector of Police (Civil/Male) in terms of the advertisement dated 24.04.2010; and then re-consider the representation of the petitioner afresh, keeping in mind that this Court never directed for outright appointment of those four other candidates except for consideration of their representation in the common order dated 16.09.2021. Since the recruitment is of the year 2010, it is further directed that the whole exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

[5] Mr. Th. Khagemba, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the judgment and order dated 16.06.2025 in WP(C) No. 1110 of 2022 has not been challenged by the State respondent before the appellate forum and the same has attained finality and the contempt petition is pending before this Court for non-compliance of the direction.

[6] Mr. S. Niranjana, learned G.A. for the State respondent, submits that the petitioner herein and the petitioner in WP(C) No. 1110 of 2022 appeared in the same recruitment for the post of ASI. However,

he has no instruction as to whether the direction in the order dated 16.06.2025 has been implemented or not till date.

[7] This Court has perused the materials on record. The petitioner herein and the petitioner in WP(C) No. 1110 of 2022 appeared in the same recruitment for ASI. The stand of the State respondent is also similar in both cases that the petitioners [in both the cases who are UR candidates] could not be considered as they failed to secure qualifying mark of 51.

[8] In the order dated 16.06.2025, this Court has already rejected the stand of the State Government that the qualifying mark for UR candidate is 51 and it was directed to the State respondent to fix the cut off mark for UR candidate in terms of the advertisement dated 24.04.2010 and reconsider the representation submitted by the petitioner therein.

[9] This Court is of the view that the fact of the present case and that of WP(C) No. 1110 of 2022 are similar. In the circumstances, the impugned order dated 20.11.2024, rejecting the representations submitted by the petitioner, is set aside and the same be considered afresh after determination of the appropriate qualifying mark for UR candidate, as directed in WP(C) No. 1110 of 2022.

[10] With this observations, writ petition is disposed of. It is made clear that this Court does not express any opinion on the merit of the present case. The direction is confined to consider the representation of the petitioner after determining the qualifying mark for UR candidate in terms of the order dated 16.06.2025 in WP(C) No. 1110 of 2022.

JUDGE

Kh. Joshua Maring

**KH.
JOSHUA
MARING**

Digitally signed
by KH. JOSHUA
MARING
Date: 2026.06.16
17:57:20 +05'30'