Yumkham Rother
Digitally signed by Yumkham Rother
Date: 2020.12.17 15:31:42 +05'30'

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR

AT IMPHAL

Rev. Petn. No. 3 of 2020

(Ref:- W.A. No. 19 of 2017)

1. Shri Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Y. Nabakishwor, a resident of Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, District Kakching, Manipur.
2. Shri Ningombam Rabichandra Meetei, aged about 28 years, S/o N. Suramani, a resident of Langmeidong Maning Leikai, P.O. Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, District Kakching, Manipur.
3. Shri Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh aged about 35 S/o. Harimohan a resident of Kalinagar Jiribam, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, District Jiribam, Manipur.
4. Shri SL Kamkhohao aged about 32 years S/o. SL Lenpao, a resident of Motbung, P.O. Motbung & P.S. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur.
5. Smt. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o. Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
6. Shri Laiphrakpam Thomson aged about 30 years S/o. L. Ibohanbi Singh a resident of Moirang Kampu Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.

… Petitioners

-Versus-

1. The Manipur Public Service Commission through its Secretary.
2. The State of Manipur, represented by the Commissioner/Secretary, D.P., Government of Manipur.
3. The Director, Manipur Judicial Academy.

…Principal Respondent

4. Ms. Shalini Chingtham, aged about 33 years, D/o Chingtham Bikramjit, a resident of Kwakeithel Mayai Koibi, P.O. Imphal and P.S Lamphel, Imphal West, Manipur.
5. Shri Khoirom Sidhartha Singh aged about 28 years, S/O Khoiram Joykumar, resident of Lalambung Makhong Khoirom Leikai, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
6. Ms. Takhellambam Meenakshi Devi aged about 35 years, D/O Takhelambam Shantikumar Singh, resident of Thangmeiband Lairenhanjaba Leikai, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
7. Shri Jammy Maisnam aged about 32 years, S/O Maisnam Bidyasagar, resident of Singjamei Chingamakha, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.

8. Shri L. Sandeep, aged about 32 years, S/o L. Binod Bihari Singh, resident of Mitra Samaj Leirak, Lamboikhongnangkhong, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Lamphel, Manipur.
9. Shri Yumlembam Surjit Singh aged about 41 Years, S/O Y. Kunjo Singh, resident of Kongba Makha Nandeibam Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Irilbung, Manipur.
10. Shri Hidangmayum Geetchandra Sharma aged about 29 years, S/O H Shyamkeshor Sharma, resident of Nambol Awangjiri, P.O: Nambol, P.S: Nambol, Manipur.
11. Shri Taorem Basanta Meetei aged about 34 years, S/O T. Inaobi Meitei, resident of Wangkhei Ningthem Pukhri Mapal, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Manipur.
12. Shri Thoudam Anunkumar aged about 25 years, S/O Th. Gulapi Singh, resident of Khurai Thoudam Lamlong, P.O: Lamlong, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
13. Shri Mangshatabam Chinglemba Singh aged about 24 Years, S/O Mangshatabam Manglem Singh, resident of Thangmeiband, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
14. Shri Ngaithem Banin Meitei aged about 32 years, S/O Ngaithem Thaba Meitei, resident of Yumnam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur.
15. Shri. Ghanashyam Mandingbam aged about 29 Years, S/O M. Ibomcha Singh, resident of Khurai Ningthoubung Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S: Porompat, Manipur.
16. Ms. Keisham Geetarani Devi aged about 35 Years, D/O Keisham (O) Maipakpi, resident of Sagolband Tera Khuraijam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Manipur.
17. Shri. Ph. Dinesh Chandra Singh aged about 34 Years, S/O Late Ph Surendra Singh, resident of Uripok Takhellambam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
18. Shri Nongthombam Padameshwar Singh aged about 32 Years, S/o N. Nabachandra Singh, resident of Luwangsangbam Makha Leikai, P.O Mantripukhri, P.S. Heingang, Manipur.
19. Shri. Jimpaul Samukcham aged about 33 years, S/O S. Budibanta Singh, resident of Wangkhei Ayangpali Road, P.O: Imphal, P.S Porompat, Manipur.
20. Shri M. Nilamani Singh aged about 30 years, S/O M Shyamo Singh, resident of Lamphel RIMS Road, P.O:Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
21. Shri. Gyandeep Rajkumar aged about 27 years, S/O R.K. Sashibhusan Singh, resident of Singjamei Mathak Chongtham Leikai, P.O. Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.
22. Shri W Dearson aged about 30 years, S/ W Gobardhan, resident of Chingmeirong Mamang Leikai,P.O: Lamlong, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
23. Shri Keisham Kishan Singh aged about 27 Years, S/O Late Keisham Kadam Singh, resident of Singjamei Waikhom Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S Singjamei, Manipur.

24. Shri Lisham Henthoiba aged about 32 years, S/O Lisham Bagindra, resident of Pishum Nigom Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S. Singiamei, Manipur.
25. Shri Sarangthem Vivek aged about 31 Years, S/O Sarangthem Prafullo Singh, Resident of Singjamei Chanam Pukhri Mapal, P.O: Singjamei, P.S. Singjamei, Manipur.
26. Shri Sorokhaibam Brajakumar Singh aged about 35 Years, S/O (L) S Amubi Singh, resident of Uripok Achom Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Manipur.
27. Shri Ningthoujam Roshnikumar Singh aged about 28 years, S/O N. Mangi Singh, resident of Lamphel Sanakeithel, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
28. Ms. Rinabai Salam aged about 35 Years, D/O Salam Naba Meetei, resident of Singjamei Chingamathak Pisum Makhong, P.O. Singjamei, PS Imphal, Manipur.
29. Shri Rajkumar Kenny aged about 25 years, S/O R.K. Kannwaljit resident of Sagolband Bijoy Govinda, PO:Lamphel, PS: Imphal West, Manipur.
30. Shri Takhellambam Rishikanta aged about 26 years, S/O Takhellambam Rajen, resident of Keishampat Mutum Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
31. Shri Hijam George aged about 27 years, S/O H Renu Devi, resident of Uripok Polem Leikai, P.O: Imphal,P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
32. Shri. Shougaijam Debajit Singh aged about 27 Years S/O Sh Dorendrajit Singh, resident of Canchipur, P.O.Canchipur, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.
33. Ms. Chungkham Anita Devi aged about 34 years, S/o Chungkham Birendra Singh, resident of Wangkhei Lourembam Leikai, P.O: Wangkhei, P.S: Porompat, Manıpur.
34. Ms. Irish Wahengbam aged about 28 years, D/O W Ibohal Singh, resident of Wangkhei Thokpam Leikai, PO: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Manipur.
35. Shri Alexeyev Thingbaijam aged about 24 years, S/O Th Babudhon Singh, resident of Top Awang Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P. S: Porompat, Manipur.
36. Shri. Kumojeet Thokchom aged about 28 Years, S/O Th Imo Singh, resident of Singjamei Mathak Thokchom Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur.
37. Shri. Laishram Rajesh Singh aged about 34 Years, S/O Laishram Sharat Singh, resident of Pangantabi Makha Leikai, P.O: Kakching, P.S: Sugunu, Manipur.
38. Shri Sagolshem Sarat Chandra aged about 34 years, S/O Sagolshem Brajakishore, resident of Nagamapal Singjubung Leirak, P.O: Imphal, PS: Imphal West, Manipur.
39. Ms. Langpoklakpam Doleswori aged about 27 years, D/O L Jayentakumar Pishumthongkhong, P.O: Imphal, P.S Singjamei Manipur.

40. Shri. Surendrakumar Yendrembam aged about 26 years S/O Yendrembam Bijoy Singh, resident of Changangei, P.O. Tulihal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
41. Shri Langpoklakpam Joychandra Meitei aged about 29 years, S/O L Jayentakumar Singh, resident of Pishumthongkhong, P.O. Imphal, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.
42. Shri Karam Jotin Khuman aged about 29 years, S/O (L) Karan Kumar Khuman, resident of Kyamgei Mamang Leikai, P.O: Canchipur, P.S: Irilbung, Manipur.
43. Shri Hijam Clington Luwang aged about 22 Years, S/O H Renu Devi, resident of Urnpok Polem Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal-West, Manipur.
44. Shri Homeshwor Nameirakpam aged about 31 Years, S/O N Gopeshwor Singh, resident of Chingamathak Nameirakpam Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.
45. Ms. Beetu Hanglem, aged about 32 Years, D/O H Meghachandra Singh, resident of Wahengbam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur.
46. Shri Nongmaithem Bijoy Singh aged about 26 years, S/O N Birendra Singh, resident of Tera Bazar, P.O. Imphal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur..
47. Shri. Aribam Devakishwar Sharma aged about 26 years, S/O Aribam Lokeshwar Sharma, resident of Brahmapur Aribam Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S:Porompat, Manipur.
48. Shri P. Milan Khangamcha, Head in Charge, Department of Philosophy, Manipur University, Canchipur, Imphal.
49. Shri James Konsam, aged about 25 years, S/o Konsam Gopal Singh, a resident of Uripok Sinam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur.
50. Shri Sadique Siddiki, aged about 25 years, S/o Latif Sidiki, a resident Yairipok Tullihal, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, District, Manipur.
51. Thongbram Bimolchand, aged about 35 years, S/o T. Jugin Singh, a resident of Keirenphabi, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur.
52. Shri Moirangthem Gautam, aged about 35 years, S/o M. Joykumar, a resident of Uripok Gopalji Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, District Imphal West, Manipur.
53. Shri L. Bhagat Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o L. Birendra Singh, a resident of Brahmapur Bheigabati Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
54. Ms. Pusam Salma, aged about 27 years, D/o Md. Rasid Ali, a resident of Checkon, K.R. lane, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
55. Ms. Pubashree Sanglakpam, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Gourikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Meisnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.

56. Ms. Gaitri Thangjam, aged about 27 years, D/o Th. Bimolchandra, a resident of Singjamei Sougrakpam Leikai, P.O & P.S. Singjamei, District Imphal West, Manipur.
57. Ms. Sapam Nirva Devi, aged about 25 years, D/o S. Nimaichand Singh, a resident of Khurai Changangbam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.
58. Sonia Haobijam, aged about 31 years, D/o H. Shantikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.
59. Shri Yumnam Lawrence, aged about 29 years, S/o Y. Gunamani Singh, a resident of Wangkhei Keithel Asangbi, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
60. Ms. Moirangthem Anju Devi, aged about 31 years, D/o M. Joy Singh, a resident of Khuman Leikai, Near INA Road, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur.
61. Ms. Sujata Thokchom, aged about 25 years, D/o Thokchom Lukhoi Singh, a resident of Nilakuthi, P.O. Mantripukhri, P.S. Heingang, District Imphal East, Manipur.
62. Shri Dhiraj Karan Khumanthem, aged about 24 years, S/o Dhiren Khumanthem, a resident of Thangmeiband DMC Gate, P.O Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
63. Loktongbam Leander
64. Shenyai Leima Angom
65. Khwairakpam Tompok Singh
66. Robert Longjam
67. Binita Ngangbam
68. Teresa Tangpua
69. Paotinsei Kipgen
70. Linda Ningombam
71. Lianminthang Samte
72. Mohammed Gayasuddin Khan
73. T. Khaimenlal Haokip
74. T. Joseph Lhungdim
75. Rajkumar Roshan Singh
76. Sorokhaibam Sitrajit Singh
77. Thokchom Heeraj Anand
78. Pooja Elangbam
79. Arambam Geetanjali
80. Dayachand Sorokhaibam
81. Kayenpaibam Sunderbala
82. Satkhogin Kilong
83. Hungyo Yurreikan
84. L. Thanggoulien Khongsai
85. K. Lunlenmoi Vaiphei
86. Shonjakhup Haokip

87. Sheikh Assif Shah
88. Ningthoujam Lamjingbi
89. Samukcham Jemmy
90. Soraisam Anuka
91. Atom Limananda Singh
92. Ngangbam Sanatombi
93. Reema Haobam
94. Julia Khuraijam
95. Susma Sharma Gurumayum
96. Heisnam Romio Singh
97. Charan Kumar Asem
98. Ngangbam Romia
99. Rajshree Yambem
100. Rajkumari Sanjukta
101. Victoria Huidrom
102. Thokchom Sundaraj Singh
103. O. Poireingamba Khumancha
104. Irungbam Julius Singh
105. Ningthoujam Nishikanta Singh
106. Yumlembam Paramveer
107. Yumkhaibam Jayalaxmi Devi
108. Tayenjam Clinton Singh
109. Laishram Tarajeet Singh
110. Heisnam Rameshchandra
111. Md. Hefajuddin
112. S. Tryphena Reikhenamai
113. Mohammed Nazmul Huda Khan
114. Michael Fimliensang Fimate
115. PF Lophro
116. Md. Farijuddin Khan
117. Aruw Kayina
118. Kaongamliang Riamei
119. Ramrumpam R. Shimray
120. Kasar Khonchui
121. Robert Lhungdim
122. T. Chinkhansiam
123. Gaishingthui Gangmei
124. Glory Chingthainkim SP
125. Yumnam Dhanendra Singh
126. Namthango Kahmei
127. Laikangbam Kherju
128. Maibam Gautam Singh
129. Dinesh Thingom

130. Oinam Joychandra Singh
131. Rajkumari Subhana
132. Mr. Tayenjam Clinton Singh
133. M. Rarjeshwori Oinam
134. Mr. Atom Limananda
135. Irungbam Diana
136. Mr. Samukcham Jemmy
137. Ms. Yumkhaibam Jayalakshmi Devi
138. Ms. Soraisam Anuka
139. Ms. Ngangbam Sanatombi
140. Mr. Thokchom Sundaraj Singh
141. Mr. Irungbam Julius Singh
142. Mr. Ningthoujam Nishikanta Singh
143. Mr. Md. Farijuddin Khan
144. Mr. Gaishingthui Gangmei
145. Sumpi Lorence
146. Mr. Sumpi Edmund
147. M. Justin Lunkim

… Respondents

With

Rev. Petn. No. 4 of 2020
(Ref:- W.P. (C) No. 313 of 2018)

1. The State of Manipur, represented by the Commissioner/ Secretary, Department of Personnel, Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur-795001.
2. The State of Manipur, represented thrugh its Chief Secretary, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.

… Review Petitioners

-Versus-

1. Okram Kenechi, aged about 27 years, S/o. O. Debendra Singh, resident of Khwai Nagamapal Paonam Leikai, Imphal West District, Manipur.

…Principal Respondent

2. The Manipur Public Service Commission (MPSC) represented through its Secretary, MPSC, near 2nd Battalion, Manipur Rifles, North AOC, Imphal, Manipur - 795001.

… Proforma Respondent

With

Rev. Petn. No. 5 of 2020
(Ref:- W.P. (C) No. 725 of 2017)

1. The State of Manipur, represented through its Principal Secretary/ Commissioner, Department of Personnel, Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur-795001.
2. The Commissioner/Secretary (Revenue), Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.

… Review Petitioners

-Versus-

1. Shri Khomdram Ranjan Singh, aged about 36 years, s/o Khomdram Tombi Singh, resident of Naoremthong Khullem Leikai, P.O. Imphal West, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
2. Shri Lisham Henthoiba, aged about 32 years, s/o (L) L. Bagindra, resident of Pishum Ningom Leirak, P.O. Imphal P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur 795001.
3. Shri Sorokhaibam Manganleima, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Bikramaditya Meitei, resident of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, P.S: Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
4. Shri Philem Anil Kumar Singh, aged about 31 years, s/o (L) Ph. Surendra Singh, resident of Uripok Takhellambam Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, P.S: Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.
5. Shri Sarangthem Chittaranjan Singh, aged about 31 years, s/o (L) S. Shyamchandra Singh, resident of Thangmeiband Khomdram Selungba Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, P.S:Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.
6. Shri Bobonkanta Yumnam, aged about 31 years, s/o Dr. Bijoy Kumar Yumnam, resident of Singjamei MathakThokchom Leikai, P.O: Imphal West. P.S: Imphal West Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
7. Shri Ayekpam Bhaskar, aged about 26 years, s/o A. Samungou Singh, resident of Changangei Mayai Leikai, P.O: Tulihal, P. S: Lamphel, Manipur- 795001.
8. Shri Laishram Anil Singh, aged about 25 years, s/o. London, resident of Keishampat Thiyam Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, PS: Imphal West, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
9. Shri Arbind Salam, aged about 35 years, s/o S. Shyam Chandra Singh, resident of Ningthoukhong Kha 6, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur- 795126.
10. Ms. Takhellambam Meenakshi Devi, aged about 35 years, d/o Takhellambam Shantikumar Singh, resident of Thangmeiband Lairenhanjaba Leikai, P.O: Lamphel, P.S:Imphal West, Manipur-795001
11. Ms. Huidrom Lenina Devi, aged about 27 years, d/o H. Shyamkishore Singh, resident of Sagolband Meino Leirak Maisnam

Nongthomba Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel,Imphal West, Manipur- 795001.

12. Ms. Pushpanjali Takhellambam, aged about 24 years, d/o Shri Bhupen Kumar Takhellambam, resident of Wangkhei Angom Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.

13. Ms. Wahengbam Jayalaxmi Devi, aged about 27 years, d/o W. Ibochou Singh, resident of Keinou Thongthak Awang Leikai, P.O. Nambol, P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur- 795134.

14. Ms. Hemabati Yumnam, aged about 27 years, d/o Y. Ibochou Singh, resident of Sangaiprou Maning Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West, Manipur- 795001.

15. Shri Nilojit Mayengbam, aged about 27 years, s/o Mayengbam Nilamani Singh, resident of Kwakeithel Thiyam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur- 795001.

16. Ms. Sujata Thokchom, aged about 26 years, d/o Thokchom Lukhoi Singh, resident of Nilakuthi, P.O: Mantripukhri, P.S: Heingang, Manipur- 795002.

17. Shri Thangjam Arun Singh, aged about 38 years, s/o Th. Karunamaya Singh, resident of Lamphel PDA Complex, P.O.Lamphel, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur- 795004.

18. Ms. Muktabali Chandam, aged about 31 years, d/o Shri Chandam Bikram Singh, resident of Moirangkhom Sougaijam Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001

19. Shri Lolee Goodday Kriibve Mao, aged about 30 years, s/o Lolee P. Mao, resident of Chingmeirong Mamang Leikai. P.O. Lamlong, P.S: Lamphel, Imphal East District, Manipur 795001.

20. Shri W. Dearson, aged about 30 years, s/o W. Gobardhan, resident of Chingmeirong Mamang Leikai, P.O: Lamlong.P.S: Lamphel, Manipur- 795001.

21. Ms. Irish Wahengbam, aged about 28 years, d/o W. Ibohal Singh, resident of Wangkhei Thokpam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Manipur- 795001.

22. Shri Sagolshem Sarat Chandra, aged about 35 years, s/o Sagolshem Brajakishore, resident of Nagamapal Singjubung Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.

...Principal Respondents

23. The Manipur Public Service Commission (MPSC) represented through its Secretary, MPSC, near 2nd Battalion Manipur Rifles, North AOC, Imphal, Manipur-795001.

24. Loktongbam Leander, aged about 28 years, S/o Loktongbam Swamikanta, R/o. Kwakeithel Ningthemkol, P.O. - Imphal, P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

25. Shenyai Leima Angom, aged about 28 years, D/o Narayan Angom R/o Brahmapur Bheigyabati Leikai, Imphal Municipal Council P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795005.

26. Khwairakpam Tompok Singh, aged about 33 years, S/o Kh. Subhas Singh R/o Wangkhei Angom Leikai, Imphal East, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004.

27. Robert Longjam, aged about 31 years, S/o Longjam Dwijendra Singh R/o Wangkhei Ayangpalli Road, Kongba Laishram Leikai, P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District,Manipur-795004.

28. Binita Ngangbam, aged about 32 years, D/o. Ngangbam Ibopishak Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Lourungpurel Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.

29. Teresa Tangpua, aged about 31 years, D/o. John Doukhual Tangpua, R/o. B/11 Zone 4 National Games Village, P.O. &P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795004.

30. Thongbram Bimolchand Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o T. Jugin Singh, a resident of Keirenphabi, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur.

31. Paotinsei Kipgen, aged about 29 years S/o Lamkholen Kipgen R/o Kholang Village, P.O. Kalapahar, P.S. Kangpokpi, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795122.

32. Linda Ningombam, aged about 33 years, D/o. Shanti Ningombam, R/o. Kwakeithel Akham Maning Leikai, P.O. -Imphal, P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

33. Lianminthang Samte, aged about 36 years, S/o. Khanzadong Samte, R/o. SA Road, Lamka, PO & P.S.-Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur- 795128.

34. Mohammed Gayasuddin Khan, aged 33 years, S/o. Mohammed Nashimuddin Khan, R/o. Lamding Cherapur, Sangaiyumpham, Part-2, P.O. Wanjing, P.S. Thoubal, District Thoubal, Manipur-795148

35. T. Khaimenlal Haokip, aged about 25 years, S/o. Ngamkhokam R/o. Tuibong District Head Quarter, P.O. Tuibong, P.S. - Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur - 795128.

36. T.Joseph Lhungdim, aged about 40 years, S/o Tongkhothang, R/o. Molnom Village, P.O. & P.S. Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur - 795128.

37. Shri James Konsam, aged about 25 years, S/o Konsam Gopal Singh, a resident of Uripok Sinam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S.Imphal West, Manipur.

38. Rajkumar Roshan Singh, aged about 30 years, S/o. R.K. Nando Singh, R/o. Sagolband Bijoy Gobinda Leikai, P.O. & P.S.- Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur - 795001.

39. Sorokhaibam Sitranjit Singh, aged about 29 years, S/o. S. Babudhon Singh, R/o. Waithou Bazar, P.O. - Lilong, P.S. -Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur 795130.

40. Thokchom Heeraj Anand, aged about 33 years, S/o. Thokchom Brajachand Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Sinam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur -795001.

41. Ms. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.

42. Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 41 years, S/O. Y. Nabakeshwor Singh, R/o. Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur -795001.

43. Pooja Elangbam, aged about 26 years, D/o Elangbam Priyokumar, R/o. Thangmeiband, Sinam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal west, Manipur-795001.

44. Arambam Geetanjali, aged about 32 years, D/o. Arambam Mahendra Singh, R/O. Thangmeiband Laijang Umang Lairenhanjaba Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, ImphalWest District, Manipur-795004.

45. Dayachand Sorokhaibam, S/o. Sorokhaibam Chandradhaja Singh, aged about 28 years, resident of Uripok Gopalaji Leirak, P.O. & P.S.-Imphal, Manipur.

46. Kayenpaibam Sunderbala, aged about 29 years, D/o. K. Kayenpaibam Joymangol Singh, R/o. Sagolband Tera Yengkhom Leirak, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur 795001.

47. Satkhogin Kilong, aged about 27 years, S/o. (L) Longkhohao Kilong, R/o. Tuibong Khopi Veng, P.O. & P.S.-Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur -795128.

48. Hungyo Yurreikan, aged about 36 years, S/o H. Hungyohung R/o Kamphasom, near CMO Office Phungreitang, P/O & P/S Ukhrul, Ukhrul District, Manipur, 795142.

49. L. Thanggoulien Khongsai, aged about 31 years, S/o. L Demjang Khongsai, R/o. M Songgel village, P.O.-Tuibong, P.S. Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur-795128.

50. S.L. Kamkhohao, aged about 31 years, S/o (L) S.L. Lenpao R/o. Motbung P/O Motbung, P/S Sapormeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795107.

51. K. Lunlenmoi Vaiphei aged about 25 years, S/o. K. Lamkai Vaiphei, R/o. Leilon Khunou village, Leimakhong, P.O.-Mantripukhri, PS. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur- 795002

52. Shonjakhup Haokip, aged about 26 years, S/o Jamkholet Haokip, R/o. New Molbem Village, P.O. & P.S. Sugnu, Chandel District, Manipur - 795101.

53. Shiekh Aasif Shah, aged about 33 years, S/o. (L) Abdul Hei Shah, R/o. Khergao, P.O. & P.S. - Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur- 795008

54. Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o. (L) Th. Harimohon Singh, R/O Kalinagar P.O. & PS. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur-795116.

55. Ningthoujam Lamjingbi, aged about 28 years, D/o. (L) Ningthoujam Manglem Singh, R/o. Lairikyengbam Makha Leikai, Stadium Road, P.O. - Lamlong, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal East District, Manipur-795010.

56. Shri Laishram Bhagat Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o L. Birendra Singh, a resident of Brahmapur Bheigabati Leikaı, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.

57. Samukcham Jemmy, aged about 29 years, S/o. Samukcham Aurobindro, R/o. Wangkhei Thangjam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. - Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur -795001.

58. Soraisam Anuka, aged about 32 years, D/o. Soraisam Biramangol Singh, R/o. Kwakeithel Thiyam Leikai Haorakchanbi Lampak Maning, P.O. & PS. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

59. Atom Limananda, aged about 30 years, S/o. A Nikunja Singh, R/o. Khumbong Maning Leikai, P.O. - Langjing, P.S. Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur -795113.

60. Laiphrakpam Thomson, aged about 30 years, S/o. Laiphrakpam Ibohanbi, R/o. Moirangkampu Makha Leikai, P.O.& P.S. Porompat Imphal East District, Manipur- 795005.

61. Ngangbam Sanatombi, aged about 29 years, D/o. Ngangbam Manglemjao Singh, R/o. No. 29, Kangla Sangomsang, P.O. - Lamlong, P.S. - Lamlai, Imphal East District, Manipur - 795010.

62. Reema Haobam, aged about 33 years, D/o. H. IboyaimaSingh, R/o. Qtr no 5, Type IV, RIMS Nurse Colony, P.O. & P.S.- Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur 795001.

63. Ms. Sapam Nirva Devi, aged about 25 years, D/o S. Nimaichand Singh, a resident of Khurai Changangbam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.

64. Julia Khuraijam, aged about 27 years, D/o. Khuraijam Brojen Singh, R/o. Uripok Sorbon Thingel, P.O. & P.S.Imphal, Imphal west District, Manipur-795001.

65. Susma Sharma Gurumayum, aged about 32 years D/o. Pradeep Kumar Sharma, R/O. Qtr. No. 6, type IV, CP,Lamphel, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795004.

66. Heisnam Romio Singh, aged about 31 years, S/o. Heisnam Iboton Singh, R/o. Moirang Patlou Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur - 795133.

67. Charan Kumar Ashem, aged about 26 years, S/o. Ashem Jiten Singh, R/o. Singjamei Chingamakha Ningthoujam Leikai, P.O. & P.S.- Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

68. Ngangbam Romia, aged about 29 years, D/o. Ngangbam Surchand Singh, R/o. Uripok Bachaspati Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur - 795001.

69. Rajshree Yambem, aged about 29 years, D/o. Yambem Laba, R/O Uripok Yambem leikai, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

70. Rajkumari Sanjukta, aged about 35 years, W/o. Arvind Sougaijam, R/o. Singjamei Mathak Thokchom Leikai, P.O. &P.S. - Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur - 795001.

71. Victoria Huidrom, aged about 39 years, D/o. Huidrom Mangi Singh, R/o. Haobam Marak Ngangom Leikai, P.O.-Imphal,PS.-Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

72. Thokchom Sundaraj Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o. Th. Ibomcha Singh, R/o. Uchekon Takhok Mapal, P.O. - Singjamei,P.S. - Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur -795008.

73. 0. Poireingamba Khumancha, aged about 30 years, S/o. O. Dikendra Khumancha, R/O. Wangoi Thounaojam Leikai, P.O. & PS. - Wangoi, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795009.

74. Shri Moirangthem Gautam, aged about 35 years, S/o M. Joykumar, a resident of uripok Gopalj Leikai, P.O. Imphal,P.S. Lamphel, District Imphal West, Manipur -795001

75. Irungbam Julius Singh, aged about 31 years, S/o Irungbam Dhanachandra Singh R/o Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, Imphal P/O Lamphel, P/S Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur, 795001.

76. Sonia Haobijam, aged about 31 years, D/o H. Shantikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai. P.0.Lamphel, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.

77. Ningombam Rabichandra Meitei, aged about 27 years, S/o. Ningombam Suramani Meitei, R/o. Langmeidong Maning Awang Leikai, P.O. - Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, Kakching District, Manipur - 795103.

78. Ningthoujam Nishikanta Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o. (L) Ningthoujam Shyamkumar Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Sinam Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795004.

79. Yumlembam Paramveer Singh, aged about 29 years, S/o. Y Indrakumar Singh, R/o. Keishampat Leimajam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

80. Yumkhaibam Jayalakshmi Devi, aged about 29 years, D/o. (L) Y. Biren Singh, R/o Malom Tuliyaima Maning Leikai, P.O. -Tulihal, P.S. Nambol, Imphal West District, Manipur-795140.

81. Tayenjam Clinton Singh, aged about 25 years, S/o Tayenjam Babu Singh, R/0. Leishangthem Awang Leikai, P.O & P.S. -Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur- 795138.

82. Laishram Tarajeet Singh, aged about 29 years, S/o. Laisharam Babul Singh, R/o. Keishampat Leimajam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal west District, Manipur - 795001.

83. Heisnam Rameshchandra Singh, aged about 28 years, S/o. Heisnam Iboton Singh, R/o. Moirang Patlou Leikai, P.0. & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur-795133.

84. Md. Hefajuddin, aged about 28 years, S/o. Md Hafijuddin, R/o. Santhel Mamang Leikai, P.O. & PS. Mayang Imphal, Thoubal District, Manipur- 795132.

85. S.Tryphena Reikhenamai, aged about 28 years, D/o M. Saluni Reikhenamai R/o Rikhumai Taphou H/No. 90 P/O & P/S Senapati, Senapati District, Manipur 795106.

86. Mohammed Nazmul Huda Khan, aged about 29 years, S/o. (L) Mohammed Hessamuddin Khan, R/o. Lilong Hangamthabi, P.O. & P.S. - Lilong, Thoubal District, Manipur,-795130.

87. Michael Fimliensang Fimate, aged about 31 years, S/o. (L) Albert Hmar R/o. Thailane Rengkai, P.O. & P.S. Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur- 795128.

88. PF Lophro aged about 27 years, D/o K. Pfokreni R/o Daili, House No. 98 P/0 & P/S Kangpokpi, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795129.

89. Md. Farijuddin Khan, aged about 30 years, S/o. Md. Abdur Rasheed Khan, R/o. Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795005.

90. Aruw Kayina, aged about about 32 years, S/o. (L) K Nipuni, R/o. Dewlaland, near Kids School, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal East District, Manipur - 795001.

91. Kaongamliang Riamei, aged about 28 years, S/o. Akhuan Riamei, R/o. Soubinglong (Leishok) Village, Khoupum Sub-Division, P.O. & P.S. - Khoupum, Noney District, Manipur-795147.

92. Ramrupam R. Shimray, aged about 30 years, S/o. Kathingkhai R Shimray, R/o. Somdal Village, P.O. & P.S. Somdal, Ukhrul District, Manipur- 795144.

93. Kasar Khonchui, aged about 30 years, D/o. Kasar Wungshim, R/o. Sikibung village, Phungyar Sub-Division, P.O. & PS. - Litan, Kamjong District, Manipur 795145.

94. Robert Lhungdim, aged about 30 years, S/O. Ngulkhongam Lhungdim, Kuki Christian Church, Christian Hospital Compound, Dewlahland Imphal West, Manipur-795001

95. T. Chinkhansiam, aged about 33 years, S/o. T. Sanzaliam, R/o. Type IV/CP-37, Lamphelpat, PO & PS- Lamphel, Imphal West, Manipur-795001

96. Gaishingthui Gangmei, aged about 28 years, S/o. Angam Gangmei, R/o. Dimdailong Sanjenthong, P.O. - Imphal, P.S. -Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.

97. Glory Chingthainkim SP aged, about 30 years, D/o Seikholun Singsit R/o Lailam Veng, Churachandpur P/O & P/S Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur, 795128.

98. Yumnam Dhanendra Singh, aged about 46 years, S/o. (L) Y. Norendra Singh, R/o. Soibam Leikai Ahongei Leirak, P.O. & PS. - Porompat, Imphal East District Manipur- 795005.

99. Maibam Gautam Singh, aged abotit 28 years, S/o M. Rakesh Singh R/o New Checkon, Opposite NCYC Club, P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004.

100. Ms. Pubashree Sanglakpam, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Gourikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Meisnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.

101. Dinesh Thingom, aged about 26 years, S/o. Th. Sharatkumar Singh, R/o. Singjamei Chingmakha Irom Leirak, P.O. & P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

102. Laikangbam Kherju, aged about 26 years, D/o Laikangbam VedantaSingh, R/o Nagamapal Kangjabi Leirak, Leikangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. – Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

…Proforma Respondents

With

Review Petn. No. 6 of 2020
(Ref:- W.P. (C) No. 606 of 2017)

1. Shri Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Y. Nabakishwor, a resident of Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, District Kakching, Manipur.
2. Shri Ningombam Rabichandra Meetei, aged about 28 years, S/o N. Suramani, a resident of Langmeidong Maning Leikai, P.O. Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, District Kakching, Manipur.
3. Shri Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh aged about 35 S/o. Harimohan a resident of Kalinagar Jiribam, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, District Jiribam, Manipur.
4. Shri SL Kamkhohao aged about 32 years S/o. SL Lenpao, a resident of Motbung, P.O. Motbung & P.S. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur.
5. Smt. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o. Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
6. Shri Laiphrakpam Thomson aged about 30 years S/o. L. Ibohanbi Singh a resident of Moirang Kampu Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.

...Petitioners

-Versus-

1. The Manipur Public Service Commission through its Secretary.
2. The State of Manipur, represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (D.P.) and Commissioner/Secretary (Revenue), Government of Manipur.
3. Shri Yumlembam Surjit Singh aged about 41 Years, S/O Y Kunjo Singh, resident of Kongba Makha Nandeibam Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Irilbung, Manipur.
4. Shri Hidangmayum Geetchandra Sharma aged about 29 years, S/O H Shyamkeshor Sharma, resident of Nambol Awangjiri, P.O: Nambol, P.S: Nambol, Manipur.

5. Wangmayum Muktar Rahaman aged about 28 years, S/O W Najimuddin Shah, resident of Oinam Sawombung, P.O: Wangoi, P.S: Wangoi, Manipur.
6. Shri Gyandeep Rajkumar aged about 27 years, S/o R.K. Sashibhusan Singh, resident of Singjamei Mathak Chongtham Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.
7. Shri Debajit Singh aged about 27 Years, S/O Sh Dorendrajit Singh, resident of Canchipur, P.O:, Canchipur, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.
8. Shri Sarangthem Vivek aged about 31 Years, S/O Sarangthem Prafullo Singh, Resident of Singjamei Chanam Pukhri Mapal, P.O: Singjamei, P.S:Singjamei, Manipur.
9. Shri Thoudam Arunkumar aged about 25 years, S/o Th. Gulapi Singh, resident of Khurai Thoudam Lamlong, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur
10. Shri Joychandra Loukrakpam aged about 25 Years, S/O L Shyam Singh, resident of Thoubal, P.O. Thoubal, P.S: Thoubal, Manipur.
11. Shri Hijam George aged about 27 years, S/O H Renu Devi, resident of Uripok Polem Leikai, P.O: Imphal,P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
12. Shri Takhellambam Rishikanta aged about 26 years, S/O Takhellambam Rajen, resident of Keishampat Mutum Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
13. Shri Rajkumar Kenny aged about 25 years, S/O R.K. Kannwaljit, resident of Sagolband Bijoy Govinda, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
14. Shri Mayanglangbam Nelson Singh aged about 32 Years, S/O Mayanglangbam Kunjabihari Singh, resident of Sagolband Meino Leirak , P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
15. Shri Yumnam Lalit Singh aged about 34 Years, S/O Y Neta Singh, resident ofYumnam Leikai Chingamathak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur.
16. Shri Rubha Angom aged about 27 years, S/O Angom Russia, resident of Uripok Achom Leikai, P.O: imphal,P.S: lamphel, Manipur.
17. Md. Abdul Sameer aged about 28 Years, S/O Abdur Rajak, resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S: Porompat, Manipur.
18. Shri Aribam Devakishwar Sharma aged about 26 years, S/o Aribam Lokeshwar Sharma, resident of Brahmapur Aribam Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S: Porompat, Manipur.
19. Shri Nongthongbam Padameshwar Singh aged about 32 Years, S/O N Nabachandra Singh, resident of Luwangsangbam Makha Leikai, P.O: Mantripukhri, P.S: Heingang, Manipur.
20. Ms. Keisham Geetarani Devi aged about 35 Years, D/O Keisham (O) Maipakpi, resident of Sagolband Tera Khuraijam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel,Manipur.

21. Ms. Rinabai Salam aged about 35 Years, D/O Salam Naba Meetei, resident of Singjamei Chingamathak Pisum Makhong, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Imphal, Manipur.
22. Shri Nongmaithem Bijoy Singh aged about 26 years, S/O N Birendra Singh, resident of Tera Bazar, P.O.Imphal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
23. Shri Mutum Nilamani Singh aged about 30 years, S/O M Shyamo Singh, resident of Lamphel RIMS Road,P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
24. Shri Ningthoujam Roshnikumar Singh aged about 28 years, S/O N. Mangi Singh, resident of Lamphel Sanakeithel, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.

… Respondents

With

Rev. Petn. No. 7 of 2020
(Ref:- W.A. No. 29 of 2017)

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Chief Secretary, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
2. The Commissioner/Secretary, Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.

… Review Petitioners

-Versus-

1. Shri Laishram Deban Singh, aged about 38 years, s/o Late Laishram Mohon Singh, resident of Khangabok Mayai Leikai,P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur- 795138
2. Shri Kshetrimayum Birosh Singh, aged about 30 years, s/o Ksh. Ibochou Singh, resident of Brahampur Bheigyapati Leikai Kongba Road, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur 795005
3. Shri Shambanduram Surjit Singh, aged about 31 years, s/o Sh. Ibohanbi Singh, resident of Brahampur BheigyapatiLeikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur- 795005.
4. Shri Nongmaithem Surajkumar, aged about 26 years, s/o Nongmaithem Hemanta, resident of Lairikyengbam Leikai Salam Leirak, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal East District, Manipur- 795010.
5. Md. Mustaque Khan, aged about 28 years, s/o Md. Abdul Gaffar, resident of Lilong Chingkham Makha, P.O. & P.S. Lilong, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795130.
6. Shri Kangabam Pritam, aged about 30 years, s/o K. Nareskumar Singh, resident of Keishampat Thiyam Leikai P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001
7. Shri Thounaojam Ropeshtajit Singh, aged about 28 years,s/o Th. Ibobi Singh, resident of Utlou Mayai Leikai, P.O. &P.S. Nambol, Bishnupur District, Manipur 795134.

8. Shri Th. Sanjitkumar Singh, aged about 34 years, s/o Th. Ngouba Singh, resident of Mayang Imphal Than Maning.P.O. & P.S. Mayang Imphal, Imphal west District, Manipur-795132.
9. Shri Mayanglangbam Nelson Singh, aged about 32 years s/o Mayanglangbam Kunjabihari Singh, resident of Sagolband Meino Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001
10. Shri Khwairakpam Munindra Singh, aged about 32 years, s/o Kh. Kiran Kumar, resident of Singjamei Torban Kshetri Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001
11. Shri Yumnam Lalit Singh, aged about 34 years, s/o Y. Neta Singh, resident of Yumnam Leikai Chingamathak, P.O. &P.S: Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
12. Shri Laishram Amarjit Singh, aged about 28 years, s/o L Tomba Singh, resident of Mayang Imphal Thana Wangkhei Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Mayang Imphal, Imphal west District,Manipur- 795132.
13. Shri Aguigai Kahmei, aged about 33 years, s/o Kalinguang Kahmei, resident of Happy Villa Tamenglong. P.O. & P.S. Tamenglong. Tamenglong District, Manipur- 795141
14. Shri Thangjam Supreme Singh, aged about 26 years, s/o Shri Thangjam Sundaram Singh, resident of Singjamei Wangma Mongkhang Lambi, P.O. Singjamei, P.S. Irilbung Imphal East District, Manipur -795008
15. Shri Sapam Ammo Singh, aged about 28 years, s/o Sapam Mohendro Singh, resident of Singjamei Sapam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.
16. Ms. Kimy Phurailatpam, aged about 27 years, d/o (L) Ph. Ratan Sharma, resident of Thangapat Mapal, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur- 795001.
17. Shri G. Tarunkumar Sharma, aged about 36 years, s/o G. Mukherjee Sharma, resident of Brahmapur Aribam Leikai, P.O. & P.S: Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur795001.
18. Shri Khundrakpam Jasper Singh, aged about 27 years, s/o (L) Kh. Apabi Singh, resident of Keishamthong Hodam Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur 795001.
19. Ms. Kh. Hemabati, aged about 30 years, d/o (L) Kh. Apabi Singh, resident of Kyamgei, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal East District, Manipur -795001.

…Principal Respondents

20. The Manipur Public Service Commission (MPSC), represented through its Secretary, MPSC, near 2nd Battalion Manipur Rifles, North AOC, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
21. Shri James Konsam, aged about 25 years, S/o Konsam Gopal Singh, a resident of Uripok Sinam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.
22. Md. Sadique Siddiki, aged about 25 years, S/o Latif Sidiki, a resident Yairipok Tullihal, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, District, Manipur– 795001.

23. ShriThongbram Bimolchand, aged about 35 years, S/o T. Jugin Singh, a resident of Keirenphabi, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur– 795001.
24. Shri Moirangthem Gautam, aged about 35 years, S/o M. Joykumar, a resident of Uripok Gopalji Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, District Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.
25. Ms. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.
26. Shri L. Bhagat Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o L. Birendra Singh, a resident of Brahmapur Bheigabati Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
27. Ms. Pusam Salma, aged about 27 years, D/o Md. Rasid Ali, a resident of Checkon, K.R. lane, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur– 795001.
28. Ms. Pubashree Sanglakpam, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Gourikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Meisnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.
29. Ms. Gaitri Thangjam, aged about 27 years, D/o Th. Bimolchandra, a resident of Singjamei Sougrakpam Leikai, P.O & P.S. Singjamei, District Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.
30. Ms. Sapam Nirva Devi, aged about 25 years, D/o Nimaichand Singh, a resident of Khurai Chngangbam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.
31. Ms. Sonia Haobijam, aged about 31 years, D/o H. Shantikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.
32. Shri Yumnam Lawrence, aged about 29 years, S/o Y. Gunamani Singh, a resident of Wangkhei Keithel Asangbi, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur– 795001.
33. Ms. Moirangthem Anju Devi, aged about 31 years, D/o M. Joy Singh, a resident of Khuman Leikai, Near INA Road, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur– 795001.
34. Ms. Sujata Thokchom, aged about 25 years, D/o Thokchom Lukhoi Singh, a resident of Nilakuthi, P.O. Mantripukhri, P.S. Heingang, District Imphal East, Manipur– 795001.
35. Shri Dhiraj Karan Khumanthem, aged about 24 years, S/o Dhiren Khumanthem, a resident of Thangmeiband DMC Gate, P.O Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur– 795001.

…Proforma Respondents

With

Rev. Petn. No. 8 of 2020
(Ref:- W.A. No. 19 of 2017)

The State of Manipur, represented by the Commissioner/Secretary, D.P., Government of Manipur, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Manipur, Pin – 795001.

… Petitioner

-Versus-

1. Ms. Shalini Chingtham, aged about 33 years, D/o Chingtham Bikramjit, a resident of Kwakeithel Mayai Koibi, P.O. Imphal and P.S Lamphel, Imphal West, Manipur-795002.
2. Shri Khoirom Sidhartha Singh aged about 28 years, S/O Khoiram Joykumar, resident of Lalambung Makhong Khoirom Leikai, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
3. Ms. Takhellambam Meenakshi Devi aged about 35 years, D/O Takhelambam Shantikumar Singh, resident of Thangmeiband Lairenhanjaba Leikai, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
4. Shri Jammy Maisnam aged about 32 years, S/O Maisnam Bidyasagar, resident of Singjamei Chingamakha, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
5. Shri L. Sandeep, aged about 32 years, S/o L. Binod Bihari Singh, resident of Mitra Samaj Leirak, Lamboikhongnangkhong, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
6. Shri Yumlembam Surjit Singh aged about 41 Years, S/O Y. Kunjo Singh, resident of Kongba Makha Nandeibam Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Irilbung, Manipur-795001.
7. Shri Hidangmayum Geetchandra Sharma aged about 29 years, S/O H Shyamkeshor Sharma, resident of Nambol Awangjiri, P.O: Nambol, P.S: Nambol, Manipur-795001.
8. Shri Taorem Basanta Meetei aged about 34 years, S/O T. Inaobi Meitei, resident of Wangkhei Ningthem Pukhri Mapal, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Manipur-795001.
9. Shri Thoudam Anunkumar aged about 25 years, S/O Th. Gulapi Singh, resident of Khurai Thoudam Lamlong, P.O: Lamlong, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
10. Shri Mangshatabam Chinglemba Singh aged about 24 Years, S/O Mangshatabam Manglem Singh, resident of Thangmeiband, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
11. Shri Ngaithem Banin Meitei aged about 32 years, S/O Ngaithem Thaba Meitei, resident of Yumnam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur-795001.
12. Shri. Ghanashyam Mandingbam aged about 29 Years, S/O M. Ibomcha Singh, resident of Khurai Ningthoubung Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S: Porompat, Manipur-795001.
13. Ms. Keisham Geetarani Devi aged about 35 Years, D/O Keisham (O) Maipakpi, resident of Sagolband Tera Khuraijam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
14. Shri. Ph. Dinesh Chandra Singh aged about 34 Years, S/O Late Ph Surendra Singh, resident of Uripok Takhellambam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel Manipur-795001.
15. Shri Nongthombam Padameshwar Singh aged about 32 Years, S/o N. Nabachandra Singh, resident of Luwangsangbam Makha Leikai, P.O Mantripukhri, P.S. Heingang, Manipur-795001.

16. Shri. Jimpaul Samukcham aged about 33 years, S/O S. Budibanta Singh, resident of Wangkhei Ayangpali Road, P.O: Imphal, P.S Porompat, Manipur-795001.
17. Shri M. Nilamani Singh aged about 30 years, S/O M Shyamo Singh, resident of Lamphel RIMS Road, P.O:Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
18. Shri. Gyandeep Rajkumar aged about 27 years, S/O R.K. Sashibhusan Singh, resident of Singjamei Mathak Chongtham Leikai, P.O. Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
19. Shri W Dearson aged about 30 years, S/ W Gobardhan, resident of Chingmeirong Mamang Leikai,P.O: Lamlong, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
20. Shri Keisham Kishan Singh aged about 27 Years, S/O Late Keisham Kadam Singh, resident of Singjamei Waikhom Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
21. Shri Lisham Henthoiba aged about 32 years, S/O Lisham Bagindra, resident of Pishum Nigom Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S. Singiamei, Manipur.
22. Shri Sarangthem Vivek aged about 31 Years, S/O Sarangthem Prafullo Singh, Resident of Singjamei Chanam Pukhri Mapal, P.O: Singjamei, P.S. Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
23. Shri Sorokhaibam Brajakumar Singh aged about 35 Years, S/O (L) S. Amubi Singh, resident of Uripok Achom Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
24. Shri Ningthoujam Roshnikumar Singh aged about 28 years, S/O N. Mangi Singh, resident of Lamphel Sanakeithel, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
25. Ms. Rinabai Salam aged about 35 Years, D/O Salam Naba Meetei, resident of Singjamei Chingamathak Pisum Makhong, P.O. Singjamei, PS Imphal, Manipur-795001.
26. Shri Rajkumar Kenny aged about 25 years, S/O R.K. Kannwaljit resident of Sagolband Bijoy Govinda, PO:Lamphel, PS: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
27. Shri Takhellambam Rishikanta aged about 26 years, S/O Takhellambam Rajen, resident of Keishampat Mutum Lcirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
28. Shri Hijam George aged about 27 years, S/O H Renu Devi, resident of Unpok Polem Leikai, P.O: Imphal,P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
29. Shri. Shougaijam Debajit Singh aged about 27 Years S/O Sh Dorendrajit Singh, resident of Canchipur, P.O.Canchipur, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
30. Ms. Chungkham Anita Devi aged about 34 years, S/o Chungkham Birendra Singh, resident of Wangkhei Lourembam Leikai, P.O: Wangkhei, P.S: Porompat, Manıpur. -795001.
31. Ms. Irish Wahengbam aged about 28 years, D/O W Ibohal Singh, resident of Wangkhei Thokpam Leikai, PO: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Manipur-795001.

32. Shri Alexeyev Thingbaijam aged about 24 years, S/O Th Babudhon Singh, resident of Top Awang Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P. S: Porompat, Manipur-795001.
33. Shri. Kumojeet Thokchom aged about 28 Years, S/O Th Imo Singh, resident of Singjamei Mathak Thokchom Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur-795001.
34. Shri. Laishram Rajesh Singh aged about 34 Years, S/O Laishram Sharat Singh, resident of Pangantabi Makha Leikai, P.O: Kakching, P.S: Sugunu, Manipur-795001.
35. Shri Sagolshem Sarat Chandra aged about 34 years, S/O Sagolshem Brajakishore, resident of Nagamapal Singjubung Leirak, P.O: Imphal, PS: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
36. Ms. Langpoklakpam Doleswori aged about 27 years, D/O L Jayentakumar Pishumthongkhong, P.O: Imphal, P.S Singjamei Manipur-795001.
37. Shri. Surendrakumar Yendrembam aged about 26 years S/O Yendrembam Bijoy Singh, resident of Changangei, P.O. Tulihal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
38. Shri Langpoklakpam Joychandra Meitei aged about 29 years, S/O L Jayentakumar Singh, resident of Pishumthongkhong, P.O. Imphal, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
39. Shri Karam Jotin Khuman aged about 29 years, S/O (L) Karan Kumar Khuman, resident of Kyamgei Mamang Leikai, P.O: Canchipur, P.S: Irilbung, Manipur-795001.
40. Shri Hijam Clington Luwang aged about 22 Years, S/O H Renu Devi, resident of Urnpok Polem Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal-West, Manipur-795001.
41. Shri Homeshwor Nameirakpam aged about 31 Years, S/O N Gopeshwor Singh, resident of Chingamathak Nameirakpam Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
42. Ms. Beetu Hanglem, aged about 32 Years, D/O H Meghachandra Singh, resident of Wahengbam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur-795001.
43. Shri Nongmaithem Bijoy Singh aged about 26 years, S/O N Birendra Singh, resident of Tera Bazar, P.O. Imphal, P. S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.
44. Shri. Aribam Devakishwar Sharma aged about 26 years, S/O Aribam Lokeshwar Sharma, resident of Brahmapur Aribam Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S:Porompat, Manipur-795001.

… Principal Respondents

45. The Manipur Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, North AOC, D.M. Road, Imphal, Manipur-795001.
46. The Director, Manipur Judicial Academy, Chingmeirong, Imphal, Manipur-795002.
47. Shri P. Milan Khangamcha, Head in Charge, Department of Philosophy, Manipur University, Canchipur, Imphal-795001.

48. Shri James Konsam, aged about 25 years, S/o Konsam Gopal Singh, a resident of Uripok Sinam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
49. Shri Sadique Siddiki, aged about 25 years, S/o Latif Sidiki, a resident Yairipok Tullihal, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, District, Manipur-795001.
50. Thongbram Bimolchand, aged about 35 years, S/o T. Jugin Singh, a resident of Keirenphabi, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur-795001.
51. Shri Moirangthem Gautam, aged about 35 years, S/o M. Joykumar, a resident of Uripok Gopalji Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, District Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
52. Ms. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
53. Shri L. Bhagat Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o L. Birendra Singh, a resident of Brahmapur Bheigabati Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur-795001.
54. Ms. Pusam Salma, aged about 27 years, D/o Md. Rasid Ali, a resident of Checkon, K.R. lane, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur-795001.
55. Ms. Pubashree Sanglakpam, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Gourikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Meisnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
56. Ms. Gaitri Thangjam, aged about 27 years, D/o Th. Bimolchandra, a resident of Singjamei Sougrakpam Leikai, P.O & P.S. Singjamei, District Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
57. Ms. Sapam Nirva Devi, aged about 25 years, D/o S. Nimaichand Singh, a resident of Khurai Changangbam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
58. Sonia Haobijam, aged about 31 years, D/o H. Shantikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
59. Shri Yumnam Lawrence, aged about 29 years, S/o Y. Gunamani Singh, a resident of Wangkhei Keithel Asangbi, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur-795001.
60. Ms. Moirangthem Anju Devi, aged about 31 years, D/o M. Joy Singh, a resident of Khuman Leikai, Near INA Road, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur-795001.
61. Ms. Sujata Thokchom, aged about 25 years, D/o Thokchom Lukhoi Singh, a resident of Nilakuthi, P.O. Mantripukhri, P.S. Heingang, District Imphal East, Manipur-795001.
62. Shri Dhiraj Karan Khumanthem, aged about 24 years, S/o Dhiren Khumanthem, a resident of Thangmeiband DMC Gate, P.O Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
63. Loktongbam Leander, aged about 28 years, S/o. Loktongbam Swamikanta, R/o. Kwakeithel Ningthemkol, P.O. -Imphal, P.S. -Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

64. Shenyai Leima Angom, aged about 28 years, D/o Narayan Angom R/o Brahmapur Bheigyabati Leikai, Imphal Municipal Council P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795005.
65. Khwairakpam Tompok Singh, aged about 33 years, S/o Kh. Subhas Singh R/o Wangkhei Angom Leikai, Imphal East, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004.
66. Robert Longjam, aged about 31 years, S/o Longjam Dwijendra Singh R/o Wangkhei Ayangpalli Road, Kongba Laishram Leikai, P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004
67. Binita Ngangbam, aged about 32 years, D/o. Ngangbam Ibopishak Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Lourungpurel Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
68. Teresa Tangpua, aged about 31 years, D/o. John Doukhual Tangpua, R/o. B/11 Zone 4 National Games Village, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795004.
69. Paotinsei Kipgen, aged about 29 years S/o Lamkholen Kipgen R/o Kholang Village, P/O Kalapahar, P/S Kangpokpi, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795122.
70. Linda Ningombam, aged about 33 years, D/o. Shanti Ningombam, R/o. Kwakeithel Akham Maning Leikai, P.O. - Imphal, P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
71. Lianminthang Samte, aged about 36 years, S/o. Khanzadong Samte, R/o. SA Road, Lamka, PO & P.S. - Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur- 795128.
72. Mohammed Gayasuddin Khan, aged 33 years, S/o. Mohammed Nashimuddin Khan, R/o. Lamding Cherapur, Sangaiyumpham, Part-2, PO Wanjing, PS Thoubal, District Thoubal, Manipur-795148
73. T.Khaimenlal Haokip aged about 25 years, S/o. Ngamkhokam R/o. Tuibong District Head Quarter, P.O. Tuibong, P.S. - Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur - 795128.
74. T.Joseph Lhungdim, aged about 40 years, S/o Tongkhothang, R/o. Molnom Village, P.O.& PS. Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur - 795128.
75. Rajkumar Roshan Singh, aged about 30 years, S/o. R.K. Nando Singh, R/o. Sagolband Bijoy Gobinda Leikai, P.O. & P.S.- Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur - 795001.
76. Sorokhaibam Sitranjit Singh, aged about 29 years, S/o. S. Babudhon Singh, R/o. Waithou Bazar, P.O. - Lilong, P.S. - Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur 795130.
77. Thokchom Heeraj Anand, aged about 33 years, S/o Thokchom Brajachand Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Sinam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur -795001.
78. Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 41 years, S/O. Y. Nabakeshwor Singh, R/o. Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur -795001.

79. Pooja Elangbam, aged about 26 years, D/o Elangbam Priyokumar, R/o. Thangmeiband, Sinam Leikai, PO & PS Imphal West, Manipur-795001
80. Arambam Geetanjali, aged about 32 years, D/o. Arambam Mahendra Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Laijang Umang Lairenhanjaba Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, ImphalWest District, Manipur-795004.
81. Dayachand Sorokhaibam, S/o. Sorokhaibam Chandradhaja Singh, aged about 28 years, resident of Uripok Gopalaji Leirak, P.O. & P.S.-Imphal, Manipur-795001.
82. Kayenpaibam Sunderbala, aged about 29 years, D/o. Kayenpaibam Joymangol Singh, R/o. Sagolband Tera Yengkhom Leirak, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
83. Satkhogin Kilong, aged about 27 years, S/o. (L) Longkhohao Kilong, R/o. Tuibong Khopi Veng, P.O. & P.S.-Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur-795128.
84. Hungyo Yurreikan, aged about 36 years, S/o H. Hungyohung R/o Kamphasom, near CMO Office Phungreitang, P/O & P/S Ukhrul, Ukhrul District, Manipur, 795142.
85. L. Thanggoulien Khongsai, aged about 31 years, S/o. L. Demjang Khongsai, R/o. M Songgel village, P.O.-Tuibong, P.S.-Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur-795128.
86. S.L. Kamkhohao, aged about 31 years, S/o (L) S.L. Lenpao R/o. Motbung P/O Motbung, P/S Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795107.
87. K. Lunlenmoi Vaiphei aged about 25 years, S/o. K. Lamkai Vaiphei, R/o. Leilon Khunou village, Leimakhong, P.O. - Mantripukhri, PS. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur- 795002.
88. Shonjakhup Haokip, aged about 26 years, S/o. Jamkholet Haokip, R/o. New Molbem Village, P.0. & P.S. Sugnu, Chandel District, Manipur - 795101.
89. Shiekh Aasif Shah, aged about 33 years, S/o. (L) Abdul Hei Shah, R/o. Khergao, P.O. & P.S. - Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795008
90. Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o. (L) Th Harimohon Singh, R/o. Kalinagar P.O. & PS. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur-795116.
91. Ningthoujam Lamjingbi, aged about 28 years, D/o. (L) Ningthoujam Manglem Singh, R/o. Lairikyengbam Makha Leikai, Stadium Road, P.O. - Lamlong, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal East District, Manipur-795010.
92. Samukcham Jemmy, aged about 29 years, S/o. Samukcham Aurobindro, R/o. Wangkhei Thangjam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. - Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.
93. Soraisam Anuka, aged about 32 years, D/o. Soraisam Biramangol Singh, R/o Kwakeithel Thiyam Leikai, Haorakchanbi Lampak Maning, P.O. & PS. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

94. Atom Limananda, aged about 30 years, S/o. A. Nikunja Singh, R/o. Khumbong Maning Leikai, P.O.-Langjing, P.S.-Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur-795113.
95. Laiphrakpam Thomson, aged about 30 years, S/o.Laiphrakpam Ibohanbi, R/o. Moirangkampu Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur 795005.
96. Ngangbam Sanatombi, aged about 29 years, D/o. Ngangbam Manglemjao Singh, R/o. No. 29, Kangla Sangomsang, P.O. - Lamlong, P.S. - Lamlai, Imphal East District, Manipur - 795010.
97. Reema Haobam, aged about 33 years, D/o. H. Iboyaima Singh, R/o. Qtr no 5, Type IV, RIMS Nurse Colony, P.O. & P.S.- Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
98. Julia Khuraijam, aged about 27 years, D/o. Khuraijam Brojen Singh, R/o. Uripok Sorbon Thingel, P.O. & P.S.Imphal, Imphal west District, Manipur-795001.
99. Susma Sharma Gurumayum, aged about 32 years D/o. Pradeep Kumar Sharma, R/o. Qtr. No. 6, type IV, CP, Lamphel, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795004.
100. Heisnam Romio Singh, aged about 31 years, S/o. Heisnam Iboton Singh, R/o. Moirang Patlou Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur - 795133.
101. Charan Kumar Ashem, aged about 26 years, S/o. Ashem Jiten Singh, R/o. Singjamei Chingamakha Ningthoujam Leikai, P.O. & P.S.- Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
102. Ngangbam Romia, aged about 29 years, D/o. Ngangbam Surchand Singh, R/o. Uripok Bachaspati Leikai, P.O. & P.S.Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
103. Rajshree Yambem, aged about 29 years, D/o. Yambem Laba, R/O Uripok Yambem leikai, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
104. Rajkumari Sanjukta, aged about 35 years, W/o. Arvind Sougaijam, R/o. Singjamei Mathak Thokchom Leikai, P.O. &P.S. - Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur - 795001.
105. Victoria Huidrom, aged about 39 years, D/o. Huidrom Mangi Singh, R/o. Haobam Marak Ngangom Leikai, P.O. - Imphal, PS. - Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
106. Thokchom Sundaraj Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o. Th Ibomcha Singh, R/o. Uchekon Takhok Mapal, P.O. - Singjamei, P.S. - Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur-795008.
107. 0. Poireingamba Khumancha, aged about 30 years, S/o. O. Dikendra Khumancha, R/o. Wangoi Thounaojam Leikai, P.O. & PS. - Wangoi, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795009.

108. Irungbam Julius Singh, aged about 31 years, S/o Irungbam Dhanachandra Singh R/o Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, Imphal P/O Lamphel, P/S Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur, 795001.
109. Ningombam Rabichandra Meitei, aged about 27 years, S/o. Ningombam Suramani Meitei, R/o. Langmeidong Maning Awang Leikai, P.O. - Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, Kakching District, Manipur-795103.
110. Ningthoujam Nishikanta Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o. (L) Ningthoujam Shyamkumar Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Sinam Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795004.
111. Yumlembam Paramveer Singh, aged about 29 years, S/o. Y. Indrakumar Singh, R/o. Keishampat Leimajam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
112. Yumkhaibam Jayalakshmi Devi, aged about 29 years, D/o. (L) Y.Biren Singh, R/O. Malom Tuliyaima Maning Leikai, P.O. Tulihal, P.S. Nambol, Imphal West District, Manipur-795140.
113. Tayenjam Clinton Singh, aged about 25 years, S/o Tayenjam Babu Singh, R/0. Leishangthem Awang Leikai, P.O & P.S. -Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur- 795138.
114. Laishram Tarajeet SIngh, aged about 29 years, S/o. Laisharam Babul Singh, R/o. Keishampat Leimajam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001
115. Heisnam Rameshchandra Singh, aged about 28 years, S/o. Heisnam Iboton Singh, R/o. Moirang Patlou Leikai, P.0. & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur-795133.
116. Md. Hefajuddin, aged about 28 years, S/o. Md Hafijuddin, R/o. Santhel Mamang Leikai, P.O. & PS. Mayang Imphal,Thoubal District, Manipur-795132.
117. S.Tryphena Reikhenamai, aged about 28 years, D/o M. Saluni Reikhenamai R/o Rikhumai Taphou H/No. 90 P/O & P/S Senapati, Senapati District, Manipur-795106.
118. Mohammed Nazmul Huda Khan, aged about 29 years, S/o.(L) Mohammed Hessamuddin Khan, R/o. Lilong Hangamthabi, P.O. & P.S. - Lilong, Thoubal District, Manipur-795130.
119. Michael Fimliensang Fimate, aged about 31 years, S/o. (L) Albert Hmar R/o. Thailane Rengkai, P.O. & P.S. Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur-795128.
120. PF Lophro aged about 27 years, D/o K. Pfokreni R/o Daili, House No. 98 P/O & P/S Kangpokpi, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795129.
121. Md. Farijuddin Khan, aged about 30 years, S/o. Md. Abdur Rasheed Khan, R/o. Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795005.

122. Aruw Kayina, aged about about 32 years, S/o. (L) K Nipuni, R/o. Dewlaland, near Kids School, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal East District, Manipur - 795001.
123. Kaongamliang Riamei, aged about 28 years, S/o. Akhuan Riamei, R/o. Soubinglong (Leishok) Village, Khoupum Sub-Division, P.O. & P.S. - Khoupum, Noney District, Manipur-795147.
124. Ramrupam R. Shimray, aged about 30 years, S/o. Kathingkhai R Shimray, R/o. Somdal Village, P.O. & P.S.Somdal, Ukhrul District, Manipur- 795144.
125. Kasar Khonchui, aged about 30 years, D/o. Kasar Wungshim, R/o. Sikibung Village, Phungyar Sub-Division, P.O.& PS. - Litan, Kamjong District, Manipur-795145.
126. Robert Lhungdim, aged about 30 years, S/o. Ngulkhongam Lhungdim, Kuki Christian Church, Christian Hospital Compound, Dewlahland Imphal West, Manipur-795001
127. T. Chinkhansiam, aged about 33 years, S/o. T. Sanzaliam, R/o. Type IV/CP-37, Lamphelpat, PO & PS- Lamphel, Imphal West, Manipur-795001
128. Gaishingthui Gangmei, aged about 28 years, S/o. Angam Gangmei, R/o. Dimdailong Sanjenthong, P.O.-Imphal, P.S.-Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.
129. Glory Chingthainkim SP aged, about 30 years, D/o Seikholun Singsit R/o Lailam Veng, Churachandpur P/O & P/S Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur, 795128.
130. Yumnam Dhanendra Singh, aged about 46 years, S/o. (L) Y. Norendra Singh, R/o. Soibam Leikai Ahongei Leirak, P.O. & PS. - Porompat, Imphal East District Manipur- 795005.
131. Namthango Kahmei, aged about 28 years, S/o Thiugo Thomas Kahmei, R/o Namlalong, Ward No. 2, P.O. & P.S. Tamenglong, Tamenglong District, Manipur-795141.
132. Laikangbam Kherju, aged about 26 years, D/o Laikangbam Vedanta Singh, R/o Nagamapal Kangjabi Leirak, Leikangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. – Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
133. Maibam Gautam Singh, aged about 28 years, S/o M. Rakesh Singh, R/o New Checkon, Opposite NCYC Club, P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004.
134. Dinesh Thingom, aged about 26 years, S/o Th. Sharatkumar Singh, R/o Singjamei Chingamakha Irom Leirak, P.O. & P.S.-Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
135. Oinam Joychandra Singh, aged about 28 years, S/o O. Tikendra R/o Nambol Khajiri Maning, P.O. & P.S. Nambol, Imphal West District, Manipur-795134.

(…Impleaded vide order dated 8/5/2019 passed in MC(WA) No. 6 of 2019)

136. Rajkumari Subhana, aged about years, D/o R.K. Arunkumar, R/O Yaiskul Chingakham Leikai, PO.-Imphal, P.S.-Imphal West, Imphal West Distdrict, Manipur-795001.

137. Irungbam Diana, D/o Irungbam Sukumar, R/o Peace Compound, Konung Manung, PO & PS Imphal East, Manipur-795001.

138. M. Rajeshwori Oinam, D/o Oinam Menjor Singh, R/o Kwakeithel Soibam Leikai, Near Kuthabi Ground, PO & PS Imphal West, Manipur-795001.

(…Impleaded vide Courts order dated 10/9/2019 passed in M.C.(W.A.) No. 42 of 2019 and M.C.(W.A.) No. 44 of 2019)

139. Atom Limananda, aged about 30 years, S/o. A. Nikunja Singh, R/o. Khumbong Maning Leikai, P.O.-Langjing, P.S.-Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur-795113.

140. Mr. Tayenjam Clinton Singh, aged about 25 years, S/o Tayenjam Babu Singh, R/0. Leishangthem Awang Leikai, P.O & P.S. -Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur- 795138.

141. Mr. Samukcham Jemmy, aged about 29 years, S/o. Samukcham Aurobindro, R/o. Wangkhei Thangjam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. - Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.

142. Ms. Yumkhaibam Jayalakshmi Devi, aged about 29 years, D/o. (L) Y.Biren Singh, R/o. Malom Tuliyaima Maning Leikai, P.O. Tulihal, P.S. Nambol, Imphal West District, Manipur-795140.

143. Ms. Soraisam Anuka, aged about 32 years, D/o. Soraisam Biramangol Singh, R/o Kwakeithel Thiyam Leikai, Haorakchanbi Lampak Maning, P.O. & PS. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

144. Ms. Ngangbam Sanatombi, aged about 29 years, D/o. Ngangbam Manglemjao Singh, R/o. No. 29, Kangla Sangomsang, P.O. - Lamlong, P.S. - Lamlai, Imphal East District, Manipur - 795010.

145. Mr. Thokchom Sundaraj Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o. Th Ibomcha Singh, R/o. Uchekon Takhok Mapal, P.O. - Singjamei, P.S. - Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur-795008.

146. Mr. Irungbam Julius Singh, aged about 31 years, S/o Irungbam Dhanachandra Singh R/o Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, Imphal P/O Lamphel, P/S Imphal, Imphal West District,Manipur, 795001.

147. Mr. Ningthoujam Nishikanta Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o. (L) Ningthoujam Shyamkumar Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Sinam Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795004.

148. Md. Farijuddin Khan, aged about 30 years, S/o. Md. Abdur Rasheed Khan, R/o. Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795005.

149. Gaishingthui Gangmei, aged about 28 years, S/o. Angam Gangmei, R/o. Dimdailong Sanjenthong, P.O.-Imphal, P.S.-Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.

(…Impleaded vide Courts order dated 11/9/2019 in MC(WA) No. 45 of 2019)

150. Sumpi Lorence aged 33 years, S/o S. Jerol Singh resident of First Street New Lambulane, P.O. & P.S. –Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.

151. Sumpi Edmund Anal aged 39 years, S/o S. Jerol Singh resident of First Street New Lambulane, P.O. & P.S.-Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.

152. Mr. Justin Lunkim aged 33 years, S/o Late Jamsei Lunkim resident of KCC Meolody House, Dewlahland, P.O. & P.S.-Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur;

(...Impleaded as Proforma Respondents vide Courts order dated 12/9/2019 passed in M.C.(W.A.) No. 47 of 2019)

…Proforma Respondents

With

Rev. Petn. No. 9 of 2020

(Ref:- W.P. (C) No. 313 of 2018)

1. Shri Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Y. Nabakishwor, a resident of Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, District Kakching, Manipur.
2. Shri Ningombam Rabichandra Meetei, aged about 28 years, S/o N. Suramani, a resident of Langmeidong Maning Leikai, P.O. Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, District Kakching, Manipur.
3. Shri Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh aged about 35 S/o. Harimohan a resident of Kalinagar Jiribam, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, District Jiribam, Manipur.
4. Shri SL Kamkhohao aged about 32 years S/o. SL Lenpao, a resident of Motbung, P.O. Motbung & P.S. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur.
5. Smt. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o. Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
6. Shri Laiphrakpam Thomson aged about 30 years S/o. L. Ibohanbi Singh a resident of Moirang Kampu Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.

… Petitioners

-Versus-

1. The State of Manipur, represented by the Commissioner/Secretary (DP), Government of Manipur, Manipur-795001.

2. The State of Manipur represented through its Chief Secretary, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur-795001.
3. The Manipur Public Service Commission (MPSC) through its Secretary, Imphal West District, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur.
4. Shri Okram Kenechi, aged about 29 years, S/o O. Debendra Singh, resident of Khwai Nagamapal Paonam Leikai, Imphal West District, Manpur.

... Respondents

With

Rev. Petn. No. 10 of 2020

(Ref:- W.P. (C) No. 606 of 2017)

The State of Manipur represented through its Commissioner/Secrretary (DP), Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.

… Review Petitioner

-Versus-

1. Shri Yumlembam Surjit Singh aged about 41 Years, S/O Y Kunjo Singh, resident of Kongba Makha Nandeibam Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Irilbung, Manipur-795001.
2. Shri Hidangmayum Geetchandra Sharma aged about 29 years, S/O H Shyamkeshor Sharma, resident of Nambol Awangjiri, P.O: Nambol, P.S: Nambol, Manipur-795001.
3. Wangmayum Muktar Rahaman aged about 28 years, S/O W Najimuddin Shah, resident of Oinam Sawombung, P.O: Wangoi, P.S: Wangoi, Manipur-795001.
4. Shri Gyandeep Rajkumar aged about 27 years, S/o R.K. Sashibhusan Singh, resident of Singjamei Mathak Chongtham Leikai, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur.
5. Shri Debajit Singh aged about 27 Years, S/O Sh Dorendrajit Singh, resident of Canchipur, P.O:, Canchipur, P.S: Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
6. Shri Sarangthem Vivek aged about 31 Years, S/O Sarangthem Prafullo Singh, Resident of Singjamei Chanam Pukhri Mapal, P.O: Singjamei, P.S:Singjamei, Manipur-795001.
7. Shri Thoudam Arunkumar aged about 25 years, S/o Th. Gulapi Singh, resident of Khurai Thoudam Lamlong, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
8. Shri Joychandra Loukrakpam aged about 25 Years, S/O L Shyam Singh, resident of Thoubal, P.O. Thoubal, P.S: Thoubal, Manipur.
9. Shri Hijam George aged about 27 years, S/O H Renu Devi, resident of Uripok Polem Leikai, P.O: Imphal,P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
10. Shri Takhellambam Rishikanta aged about 26 years, S/O Takhellambam Rajen, resident of Keishampat Mutum Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.

11. Shri Rajkumar Kenny aged about 25 years, S/O R.K. Kannwaljit, resident of Sagolband Bijoy Govinda, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
12. Shri Mayanglangbam Nelson Singh aged about 32 Years, S/O Mayanglangbam Kunjabihari Singh, resident of Sagolband Meino Leirak , P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur-795001.
13. Shri Yumnam Lalit Singh aged about 34 Years, S/O Y Neta Singh, resident ofYumnam Leikai Chingamathak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal, Manipur-795001.
14. Shri Rubha Angom aged about 27 years, S/O Angom Russia, resident of Uripok Achom Leikai, P.O: imphal,P.S: lamphel, Manipur-795001.
15. Md. Abdul Sameer aged about 28 Years, S/O Abdur Rajak, resident of Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S: Porompat, Manipur-795001.
16. Shri Aribam Devakishwar Sharma aged about 26 years, S/o Aribam Lokeshwar Sharma, resident of Brahmapur Aribam Leikai, P.O: Porompat, P.S: Porompat, Manipur-795001.
17. Shri Nongthongbam Padameshwar Singh aged about 32 Years, S/O N Nabachandra Singh, resident of Luwangsangbam Makha Leikai, P.O: Mantripukhri, P.S: Heingang, Manipur-795001.
18. Ms. Keisham Geetarani Devi aged about 35 Years,D/O Keisham (O) Maipakpi, resident of Sagolband Tera Khuraijam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel,Manipur-795001.
19. Ms. Rinabai Salam aged about 35 Years, D/O Salam Naba Meetei, resident of Singjamei Chingamathak Pisum Makhong, P.O: Singjamei, P.S: Imphal, Manipur-795001.
20. Shri Nongmaithem Bijoy Singh aged about 26 years, S/O N Birendra Singh, resident of Tera Bazar, P.O.Imphal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
21. Shri Mutum Nilamani Singh aged about 30 years, S/O M Shyamo Singh, resident of Lamphel RIMS Road,P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur.
22. Shri Ningthoujam Roshnikumar Singh aged about 28 years, S/O N. Mangi Singh, resident of Lamphel Sanakeithel, P.O: Lamphel, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur-795001.

…Principal Respondents

23. The Manipur Public Service Commission (MPSC), represented through its Secretary, MPSC, near 2nd Battalion Manipur Rifles, North AOC, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
24. Loktongbam Leander, aged about 28 years, S/o. Loktongbam Swamikanta, R/o. Kwakeithel Ningthemkol, P.O. -Imphal, P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
25. Shenyai Leima Angom, aged about 28 years, D/o Narayan Angom Rio Brahmapur Bheigyabati Leikai, Imphal Municipal Council P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795005.

26. Khwairakpam Tompok Singh, aged about 33 years, S/o Kh. Subhas Singh R/o Wangkhei Angom Leikai, Imphal East, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004.
27. Robert Longjam, aged about 31 years, S/o Longjam Dwijendra Singh R/o Wangkhei Ayangpalli Road, Kongba Laishram Leikai, P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004
28. Binita Ngangbam, aged about 32 years, D/o. Ngangbam Ibopishak Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Lourungpurel Leikai,P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur -795001.
29. Teresa Tangpua, aged about 31 years, D/o. John Doukhual Tangpua, R/o. B/11 Zone 4 National Games Village, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795004.
30. Thongbram Bimolchand Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o T. Jugin Singh, a resident of Keirenphabi, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur.
31. Paotinsei Kipgen, aged about 29 years S/o Lamkholen Kipgen R/o Kholang Village, P/O Kalapahar, P/S Kangpokpi, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795122.
32. Linda Ningombam, aged about 33 years, D/o. Shanti Ningombam, R/o. Kwakeithel Akham Maning Leikai, P.O. - Imphal, P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
33. Lianminthang Samte, aged about 36 years, S/o. Khanzadong Samte, R/o. SA Road, Lamka, PO & P.S. - Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur- 795128.
34. Mohammed Gayasuddin Khan, aged 33 years, S/o. Mohammed Nashimuddin Khan, R/o. Lamding Cherapur, Sangaiyumpham, Part-2, PO Wanjing, PS Thoubal, District Thoubal, Manipur-795148
35. T.Khaimenlal Haokip aged about 25 years, S/o. Ngamkhokam R/o. Tuibong District Head Quarter, P.O. Tuibong, P.S. - Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur - 795128.
36. T.Joseph Lhungdim, aged about 40 years, S/o Tongkhothang, R/o. Molnom Village, P.O.& PS. Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur - 795128.
37. Shri James Konsam. aged about 25 years, S/o Konsam GopalSingh, a resident of Uripok Sinam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S.Imphal West, Manipur.
38. Rajkumar Roshan Singh, aged about 30 years, S/o. R.K. Nando Singh, R/o. Sagolband Bijoy Gobinda Leikai, P.O. & P.S.- Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur - 795001.
39. Sorokhaibam Sitranjit Singh, aged about 29 years, S/o. S. Babudhon Singh, R/o. Waithou Bazar, P.O. - Lilong, P.S. - Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur 795130.
40. Thokchom Heeraj Anand, aged about 33 years, S/o Thokchom Brajachand Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Sinam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West, Manipur -795001.

41. Ms. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
42. Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 41 years, S/O. Y. Nabakeshwor Singh, R/o. Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, Kakching District, Manipur -795001.
43. Pooja Elangbam, aged about 26 years, D/o Elangbam Priyokumar, R/o. Thangmeiband, Sinam Leikai, PO & PS Imphal West, Manipur-795001
44. Arambam Geetanjali, aged about 32 years, D/o. Arambam Mahendra Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Laijang Umang Lairenhanjaba Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, ImphalWest District, Manipur-795004.
45. Dayachand Sorokhaibam, S/o. Sorokhaibam Chandradhaja Singh, aged about 28 years, resident of Uripok Gopalaji Leirak, P.O. & P.S.-Imphal, Manipur-795001.
46. Kayenpaibam Sunderbala, aged about 29 years, D/o. Kayenpaibam Joymangol Singh, R/o. Sagolband Tera Yengkhom Leirak, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
47. Satkhogin Kilong, aged about 27 years, S/o. (L) Longkhohao Kilong, R/o. Tuibong Khopi Veng, P.O. & P.S.-Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur 795128.
48. Hungyo Yurreikan, aged about 36 years, S/o H. Hungyohung R/o Kamphasom, near CMO Office Phungreitang, P/O & P/S Ukhrul, Ukhrul District, Manipur, 795142.
49. L. Thanggoulien Khongsai, aged about 31 years, S/o. L. Demjang Khongsai, R/o. M Songgel village, P.O.-Tuibong, P.S.-Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur-795128.
50. S.L. Kamkhohao, aged about 31 years, S/o (L) S.L. Lenpao R/o. Motbung P/O Motbung, P/S Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795107.
51. K. Lunlenmoi Vaiphei aged about 25 years, S/o. K. Lamkai Vaiphei, R/o. Leilon Khunou village, Leimakhong, P.O. - Mantripukhri, PS. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District,Manipur- 795002.
52. Shonjakhup Haokip, aged about 26 years, S/o. Jamkholet Haokip, R/o. New Molbem Village, P.0.& P.S. Sugnu, Chandel District, Manipur - 795101.
53. Shiekh Aasif Shah, aged about 33 years, S/o. (L) Abdul Hei Shah, R/o. Khergao, P.O. & P.S. - Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795008
54. Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o. (L) Th Harimohon Singh, R/o. Kalinagar P.O. & PS. Jiribam, Jiribam District, Manipur-795116.
55. Ningthoujam Lamjingbi, aged about 28 years, D/o. (L) Ningthoujam Manglem Singh, R/o. Lairikyengbam Makha Leikai, Stadium Road, P.O. - Lamlong, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal East District, Manipur-795010.

56. Shri Laishram Bhagat Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o L. Birendra Singh, a resident of Brahmapur Bheigabati Leikaı, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
57. Samukcham Jemmy, aged about 29 years, S/o. Samukcham Aurobindro, R/o. Wangkhei Thangjam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. - Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.
58. Soraisam Anuka, aged about 32 years, D/o. Soraisam Biramangol Singh, R/o Kwakeithel Thiyam Leikai Haorakchanbi Lampak Maning, P.O. & PS. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
59. Atom Limananda, aged about 30 years, S/o. A. Nikunja Singh, R/o. Khumbong Maning Leikai, P.O.-Langjing, P.S.-Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur-795113.
60. Laiphrakpam Thomson, aged about 30 years, S/o.Laiphrakpam Ibohanbi, R/o. Moirangkampu Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur 795005.
61. Ngangbam Sanatombi, aged about 29 years, D/o. Ngangbam Manglemjao Singh, R/o. No. 29, Kangla Sangomsang, P.O. - Lamlong, P.S. - Lamlai, Imphal East District, Manipur - 795010.
62. Reema Haobam, aged about 33 years, D/o. H. Iboyaima Singh, R/o. Qtr no 5, Type IV, RIMS Nurse Colony, P.O. & P.S.- Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
63. Ms. Sapam Nirva Devi, aged about 25 years, D/o S. Nimaichand Singh, a resident of Khurai Changangbam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.
64. Julia Khuraijam, aged about 27 years, D/o. Khuraijam Brojen Singh, R/o. Uripok Sorbon Thingel, P.O. & P.S.Imphal, Imphal west District, Manipur-795001.
65. Susma Sharma Gurumayum, aged about 32 years D/o. Pradeep Kumar Sharma, R/o. Qtr. No. 6, type IV, CP, Lamphel, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795004.
66. Heisnam Romio Singh, aged about 31 years, S/o. Heisnam Iboton Singh, R/o. Moirang Patlou Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur - 795133.
67. Charan Kumar Ashem, aged about 26 years, S/o. Ashem Jiten Singh, R/o. Singjamei Chingamakha Ningthoujam Leikai, P.O. & P.S.- Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
68. Ngangbam Romia, aged about 29 years, D/o. Ngangbam Surchand Singh, R/o. Uripok Bachaspati Leikai, P.O. & P.S.Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
69. Rajshree Yambem, aged about 29 years, D/o. Yambem Laba, R/O Uripok Yambem leikai, P.O. & P.S. - Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
70. Rajkumari Sanjukta, aged about 35 years, W/o. Arvind Sougaijam, R/o. Singjamei Mathak Thokchom Leikai, P.O. & P.S. - Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur - 795001.

71. Victoria Huidrom, aged about 39 years, D/o. Huidrom Mangi Singh, R/o. Haobam Marak Ngangom Leikai, P.O. - Imphal, PS. - Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
72. Thokchom Sundaraj Singh, aged about 35 years, S/o. Th Ibomcha Singh, R/o. Uchekon Takhok Mapal, P.O. - Singjamei, P.S. - Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur-795008.
73. 0. Poireingamba Khumancha, aged about 30 years, S/o. O. Dikendra Khumancha, R/o. Wangoi Thounaojam Leikai, P.O. & PS. - Wangoi, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795009.
74. Shri Moirangthem Gautam, aged about 35 years, S/o M. Joykumar, a resident of uripok Gopalj Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, District Imphal West, Manipur -795001.
75. Irungbam Julius Singh, aged about 31 years, S/o Irungbam Dhanachandra Singh R/o Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, Imphal P/O Lamphel, P/S Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur, 795001.
76. Sonia Haobijam, aged about 31 years, D/o H. Shantikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai. P.0. Lamphel, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.
77. Ningombam Rabichandra Meitei, aged about 27 years, S/o. Ningombam Suramani Meitei, R/o. Langmeidong Maning Awang Leikai, P.O. - Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, Kakching District, Manipur-795103.
78. Ningthoujam Nishikanta Singh, aged about 38 years, S/o. (L) Ningthoujam Shyamkumar Singh, R/o. Thangmeiband Sinam Leikai, P.O. - Lamphel, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795004.
79. Yumlembam Paramveer Singh, aged about 29 years, S/o. Y. Indrakumar Singh, R/o. Keishampat Leimajam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
80. Yumkhaibam Jayalakshmi Devi, aged about 29 years, D/o. (L) Y.Biren Singh, R/O. Malom Tuliyaima Maning Leikai, P.O. Tulihal, P.S. Nambol, Imphal West District, Manipur-795140.
81. Tayenjam Clinton Singh, aged about 25 years, S/o Tayenjam Babu Singh, R/0. Leishangthem Awang Leikai, P.O & P.S. -Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur- 795138.
82. Laishram Tarajeet SIngh, aged about 29 years, S/o. Laisharam Babul Singh, R/o. Keishampat Leimajam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001
83. Heisnam Rameshchandra Singh, aged about 28 years, S/o. Heisnam Iboton Singh, R/o. Moirang Patlou Leikai, P.0. & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur-795133.
84. Md. Hefajuddin, aged about 28 years, S/o. Md Hafijuddin,R/o. Santhel Mamang Leikai, P.O. & PS. Mayang Imphal,Thoubal District, Manipur-795132.
85. S.Tryphena Reikhenamai, aged about 28 years, D/o M. Saluni Reikhenamai R/o Rikhumai Taphou H/No. 90 P/O & P/S Senapati, Senapati District, Manipur-795106.

86. Mohammed Nazmul Huda Khan, aged about 29 years, S/o.(L) Mohammed Hessamuddin Khan, R/o. Lilong Hangamthabi, P.O. & P.S. - Lilong, Thoubal District, Manipur-795130.
87. Michael Fimliensang Fimate, aged about 31 years, S/o. (L) Albert Hmar R/o. Thailane Rengkai, P.0. & P.S. Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur-795128.
88. PF Lophro aged about 27 years, D/o K. Pfokreni R/o Daill, House No. 98 P/O & P/S Kangpokpi, Kangpokpi District, Manipur, 795129.
89. Md. Farijuddin Khan, aged about 30 years, S/o. Md. Abdur Rasheed Khan, R/o. Kshetri Bengoon Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795005.
90. Aruw Kayina, aged about about 32 years, S/o. (L) K Nipuni, R/o. Dewlaland, near Kids School, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal East District, Manipur - 795001.
91. Kaongamliang Riamei, aged about 28 years, S/o. Akhuan Riamei, R/o. Soubinglong (Leishok) Village, Khoupum Sub-Division, P.O. & P.S. - Khoupum, Noney District, Manipur-795147.
92. Ramrupam R. Shimray, aged about 30 years, S/o. Kathingkhai R Shimray, R/o. Somdal Village, P.O. & P.S.Somdal, Ukhrul District, Manipur- 795144.
93. Kasar Khonchui, aged about 30 years, D/o. Kasar Wungshim, R/o. Sikibung Village, Phungyar Sub-Division, P.O. & PS. - Litan, Kamjong District, Manipur-795145.
94. Robert Lhungdim, aged about 30 years, S/o. Ngulkhongam Lhungdim, Kuki Christian Church, Christian Hospital Compound, Dewlahland Imphal West, Manipur-795001
95. T. Chinkhansiam, aged about 33 years, S/o. T. Sanzaliam, R/o. Type IV/CP-37, Lamphelpat, PO & PS- Lamphel, Imphal West, Manipur-795001
96. Gaishingthui Gangmei, aged about 28 years, S/o. Angam Gangmei, R/o. Dimdailong Sanjenthong, P.O.-Imphal, P.S.-Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.
97. Glory Chingthainkim SP aged, about 30 years, D/o Seikholun Singsit R/o Lailam Veng, Churachandpur P/O & P/S Churachandpur, Churachandpur District, Manipur, 795128.
98. Yumnam Dhanendra Singh, aged about 46 years, S/o. (L) Y. Norendra Singh, R/o. Soibam Leikai Ahongei Leirak, P.O. & PS. - Porompat, Imphal East District Manipur- 795005.
99. Ms. Pubashree Sanglakpam, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Gourikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Meisnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
100. Maibam Gautam Singh, aged about 28 years, S/o M. Rakesh Singh R/o New Checkon, Opposite NCYC Club, P/O & P/S Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur, 795004.

101. Dinesh Thingom, aged about 26 years, S/o. Th. Sharatkumar Singh, R/o. Singjamei Chingmakha Irom Leirak, P.O. & P.S. - Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.

102. Laikangbam Kherju, aged about 26 years, D/o Laikangbam Vedanta Singh, R/o Nagamapal Kangjabi Leirak, Leikangbam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. – Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.

… Proforma Respondents

With

Rev. Petn. No. 11 of 2020
(Ref:- W.A. No. 29 of 2017)

1. Shri Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Y. Nabakishwor, a resident of Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, District Kakching, Manipur.
2. Shri Ningombam Rabichandra Meetei, aged about 28 years, S/o N. Suramani, a resident of Langmeidong Maning Leikai, P.O. Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, District Kakching, Manipur.
3. Shri Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh aged about 35 S/o. Harimohan a resident of Kalinagar Jiribam, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, District Jiribam, Manipur.
4. Shri SL Kamkhohao aged about 32 years S/o. SL Lenpao, a resident of Motbung, P.O. Motbung & P.S. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur.
5. Smt. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o. Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
6. Shri Laiphrakpam Thomson aged about 30 years S/o. L. Ibohanbi Singh a resident of Moirang Kampu Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.

… Petitioners

-Versus-

1. The Manipur Public Service Commission (MPSC), represented through its Secretary, MPSC, near 2nd Battalion Manipur Rifles, North AOC, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
2. The State of Manipur, represented through its Chief Secretary, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
3. The Commissioner /Secretary (DP), Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur 795001.

… Respondents

4. Shri Laishram Deban Singh, aged about 38 years, s/o Late Laishram Mohon Singh, resident of Khangabok Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur- 795138

5. Shri Kshetrimayum Birosh Singh, aged about 30 years, s/o Ksh. Ibochou Singh, resident of Brahampur Bheigyapati Leikai Kongba Road, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur -795005
6. Shri Shambanduram Surjit Singh, aged about 31 years, s/o Sh. Ibohanbi Singh, resident of Brahampur Bheigyapati Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur- 795005.
7. Shri Nongmaithem Surajkumar, aged about 26 years, s/o Nongmaithem Hemanta, resident of Lairikyengbam Leikai Salam Leirak, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal East District, Manipur-795010.
8. Md. Mustaque Khan, aged about 28 years, s/o Md. Abdul Gaffar, resident of Lilong Chingkham Makha, P.O. & P.S. Lilong, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795130.
9. Shri Kangabam Pritam, aged about 30 years, s/o K. Nareskumar Singh, resident of Keishampat Thiyam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001
10. Shri Thounaojam Ropeshtajit Singh, aged about 28 years, s/o Th. Ibobi Singh, resident of Utlou Mayai Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Nambol, Bishnupur District, Manipur-795134.
11. Shri Th. Sanjitkumar Singh, aged about 34 years, s/o Th. Ngouba Singh, resident of Mayang Imphal Than Maning, P.O. & P.S. Mayang Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795132.
12. Shri Mayanglangbam Nelson Singh, aged about 32 years, s/o Mayanglangbam Kunjabihari Singh, resident of Sagolband Meino Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001
13. Shri Khwairakpam Munindra Singh, aged about 32 years, s/o Kh. Kiran Kumar, resident of Singjamei Torban Kshetri Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Singjamei, Imphal East District,Manipur-795001
14. Shri Yumnam Lalit Singh, aged about 34 years, s/o Y. Neta Singh, resident of Yumnam Leikai Chingamathak, P.O. & P.S: Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
15. Shri Laishram Amarjit Singh, aged about 28 years, s/o L. Tomba Singh, resident of Mayang Imphal Thana Wangkhei Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Mayang Imphal, Imphal West District,Manipur- 795132.
16. Shri Aguigai Kahmei, aged about 33 years, s/o Kalinguang Kahmei, resident of Happy Villa Tamenglong. P.O. & P.S. Tamenglong. Tamenglong District, Manipur- 795141
17. Shri Thangjam Supreme Singh, aged about 26 years, s/o Shri Thangjam Sundaram Singh, resident of Singjamei Wangma Mongkhang Lambi, P.O. Singjamei, P.S. Irilbung, Imphal East District, Manipur -795008
18. Shri Sapam Ammo Singh, aged about 28 years, s/o Sapam Mohendro Singh, resident of Singjamei Sapam Leikai, P.O.& P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.
19. Ms. Kimy Phurailatpam, aged about 27 years, d/o (L) Ph. Ratan Sharma, resident of Thangapat Mapal, P.O. & P.S.Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur- 795001.

20. Shri G. Tarunkumar Sharma, aged about 36 years, s/o G. Mukherjee Sharma, resident of Brahmapur Aribam Leikai, P.O. & P.S: Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.
21. Shri Khundrakpam Jasper Singh, aged about 27 years, s/o (L) Kh. Apabi Singh, resident of Keishamthong Hodam Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
22. Ms. Kh. Hemabati, aged about 30 years, d/o (L) Kh. Apabi Singh, resident of Kyamgei, P.O. & P.S. Singjamei, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.
23. Shri James Konsam, aged about 25 years, S/o Konsam Gopal Singh, a resident of Uripok Sinam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur.
24. Md. Sadique Siddiki, aged about 25 years, S/o Latif Sidiki, a resident Yairipok Tullihal, P.O. & P.S. Yairipok, District, Manipur.
25. Thongbram Bimolchand, aged about 35 years, S/o T. Jugin Singh, a resident of Keirenphabi, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur.
26. Shri Moirangthem Gautam, aged about 35 years, S/o M. Joykumar, a resident of Uripok Gopalji Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, District Imphal West, Manipur.
27. Shri L. Bhagat Singh, aged about 27 years, S/o L. Birendra Singh, a resident of Brahmapur Bheigabati Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
28. Ms. Pusam Salma, aged about 27 years, D/o Md. Rasid Ali, a resident of Checkon, KR. lane, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
29. Ms. Pubashree Sanglakpam, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Gourikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Meisnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
30. Ms. Gaitri Thangjam, aged about 27 years, D/o Th. Bimolchandra, a resident of Singjamei Sougrakpam Leikai, P.O & P.S. Singjamei, District Imphal West, Manipur.
31. Ms. Sapam Nirva Devi, aged about 25 years, D/o S. Nimaichand Singh, a resident of Khurai Changangbam Leikai, P.O. Lamlong, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.
32. Sonia Haobijam, aged about 31 years, D/o H. Shantikumar Sharma, a resident of Thangmeiband Yumnam Leikai, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Porompat, District Imphal West, Manipur.
33. Shri Yumnam Lawrence, aged about 29 years, S/o Y. Gunamani Singh, a resident of Wangkhei Keithel Asangbi, P.O & P.S. Porompat, District Imphal East, Manipur.
34. Ms. Moirangthem Anju Devi, aged about 31 years, D/o M. Joy Singh, a resident of Khuman Leikai, Near INA Road, P.O & P.S. Moirang, Bishnupur District, Manipur.
35. Ms. Sujata Thokchom, aged about 25 years, D/o Thokchom Lukhoi Singh, a resident of Nilakuthi, P.O. Mantripukhri, P.S. Heingang, District Imphal East, Manipur.

36. Shri Dhiraj Karan Khumanthem, aged about 24 years, S/o Dhiren Khumanthem, a resident of Thangmeiband DMC Gate, P.O. Lamphel, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.

…Respondents

With

Rev. Petn. No. 12 of 2020

(Ref:- W.P. (C) No. 725 of 2017)

1. Shri Yengkhom Jivan Singh, aged about 42 years, S/o Y. Nabakishwor, a resident of Kakching Paji Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Kakching, District Kakching, Manipur.
2. Shri Ningombam Rabichandra Meetei, aged about 28 years, S/o N. Suramani, a resident of Langmeidong Maning Leikai, P.O. Kakching, P.S. Waikhong, District Kakching, Manipur.
3. Shri Thingbaijam Kamaljit Singh aged about 35 S/o. Harimohan a resident of Kalinagar Jiribam, P.O. & P.S. Jiribam, District Jiribam, Manipur.
4. Shri SL Kamkhohao aged about 32 years S/o. SL Lenpao, a resident of Motbung, P.O. Motbung & P.S. Sapermeina, Kangpokpi District, Manipur.
5. Smt. Premanandi Okram, aged about 33 years, D/o. Okram Govardhan, a resident of Uripok Sinasam Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Imphal, District Imphal West, Manipur.
6. Shri Laiphrakpam Thomson aged about 30 years S/o. L. Ibohanbi Singh a resident of Moirang Kampu Makha Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur.

… Petitioners

-Versus-

1. The Manipur Public Service Commission (MPSC) represented through its Secretary, MPSC, near 2nd Battalion, Manipur Rifles, North AOC, Imphal, Manipur - 795001.
2. The State of Manipur, represented through its Principal Secretary/ Commissioner, Department of Personnel, Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur-795001.
3. The Commissioner/Secretary (Revenue), Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Imphal, Manipur – 795001.
4. Shri Khomdram Ranjan Singh, aged about 36 years, s/o Khomdram Tombi Singh, resident of Naoremthong Khullem Leikai, P.O. Imphal West, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur – 795001.
5. Shri Lisham Henthoiba, aged about 32 years, s/o (L) L. Bagindra, resident of Pishum Ningom Leirak, P.O. Imphal P.S. Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur 795001.
6. Shri Sorokhaibam Manganleima, aged about 27 years, D/o S. Bikramaditya Meitei, resident of Kwakeithel Laishram Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, P.S: Singjamei, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.

7. Shri Philem Anil Kumar Singh, aged about 31 years, s/o (L) Ph. Surendra Singh, resident of Uripok Takhellambam Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, P.S: Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.
8. Shri Sarangthem Chittaranjan Singh, aged about 31 years, s/o (L) S. Shyamchandra Singh, resident of Thangmeiband Khomdram Selungba Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, P.S:Lamphel, Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.
9. Shri Bobonkanta Yumnam, aged about 31 years, s/o Dr. Bijoy Kumar Yumnam, resident of Singjamei MathakThokchom Leikai, P.O: Imphal West. P.S: Imphal West Imphal West District, Manipur- 795001.
10. Shri Ayekpam Bhaskar, aged about 26 years, s/o A. Samungou Singh, resident of Changangei Mayai Leikai, P.O: Tulihal, P. S: Lamphel, Manipur- 795001.
11. Shri Laishram Anil Singh, aged about 25 years, s/o. London, resident of Keishampat Thiyam Leikai, P.O: Imphal West, PS: Imphal West, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
12. Shri Arbind Salam, aged about 35 years, s/o S. Shyam Chandra Singh, resident of Ningthoukhong Kha 6, P.O. & P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur- 795126.
13. Ms. Takhellambam Meenakshi Devi, aged about 35 years, d/o Takhellambam Shantikumar Singh, resident of Thangmeiband Lairenhanjaba Leikai, P.O: Lamphel, P.S:Imphal West, Manipur- 795001
14. Ms. Huidrom Lenina Devi, aged about 27 years, d/o H. Shyamkishore Singh, resident of Sagolband Meino Leirak Maisnam Nongthomba Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel,Imphal West, Manipur- 795001.
15. Ms. Pushpanjali Takhellambam, aged about 24 years, d/o Shri Bhupen Kumar Takhellambam, resident of Wangkhei Angom Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Imphal East District, Manipur-795001.
16. Ms. Wahengbam Jayalaxmi Devi, aged about 27 years, d/o W. Ibochou Singh, resident of Keinou Thongthak Awang Leikai, P.O. Nambol, P.S. Bishnupur, Bishnupur District, Manipur- 795134.
17. Ms. Hemabati Yumnam, aged about 27 years, d/o Y. Ibochou Singh, resident of Sangaiprou Maning Leikai, P.O. Imphal, P.S. Lamphel, Imphal West, Manipur- 795001.
18. Shri Nilojit Mayengbam, aged about 27 years, s/o Mayengbam Nilamani Singh, resident of Kwakeithel Thiyam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Lamphel, Manipur- 795001.
19. Ms. Sujata Thokchom, aged about 26 years, d/o Thokchom Lukhoi Singh, resident of Nilakuthi, P.O: Mantripukhri, P.S: Heingang, Manipur- 795002.
20. Shri Thangjam Arun Singh, aged about 38 years, s/o Th. Karunamaya Singh, resident of Lamphel PDA Complex, P.O.Lamphel, P.S. Imphal West, Manipur- 795004.
21. Ms. Muktabali Chandam, aged about 31 years, d/o Shri Chandam Bikram Singh, resident of Moirangkhom Sougaijam Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001

22. Shri Lolee Goodday Kriibve Mao, aged about 30 years, s/o Lolee P. Mao, resident of Chingmeirong Mamang Leikai. P.O. Lamlong, P.S: Lamphel, Imphal East District, Manipur 795001.
23. Shri W. Dearson, aged about 30 years, s/o W. Gobardhan, resident of Chingmeirong Mamang Leikai, P.O: Lamlong.P.S: Lamphel, Manipur- 795001.
24. Ms. Irish Wahengbam, aged about 28 years, d/o W. Ibohal Singh, resident of Wangkhei Thokpam Leikai, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Porompat, Manipur- 795001.
25. Shri Sagolshem Sarat Chandra, aged about 35 years, s/o Sagolshem Brajakishore, resident of Nagamapal Singjubung Leirak, P.O: Imphal, P.S: Imphal West, Manipur.
26. Loktongbam Leander
27. Shenyai Leima Angom
28. Khwairakpam Tompok Singh
29. Robert Longjam
30. Binita Ngangbam
31. Teresa Tangpua
32. Tongbram Bimolchand Singh
33. Paotinsei Kipgen
34. Linda Ningombam
35. Lianminthang Samte
36. Mohammed Gayasuddin Khan
37. T. Khaimenlal Haokip
38. T. Joseph Lhungdim
39. James Konsam
40. Rajkumar Roshan Singh
41. Sorokhaibam Sitrajit Singh
42. Thokchom Heeraj Anand
43. Pooja Elangbam
44. Arambam Geetanjali
45. Dayachand Sorokhaibam
46. Kayenpaibam Sunderbala
47. Satkhogin Kilong
48. Hungyo Yurreikan
49. L. Thanggoulien Khongsai
50. K. Lunlenmoi Vaiphei
51. Shonjakhup Haokip
52. Sheikh Assif Shah
53. Ningthoujam Lamjingbi
54. Laishram Bhagat Singh
55. Samukcham Jemmy
56. Soraisam Anuka
57. Atom Limananda Singh

58. Ngangbam Sanatombi
59. Reema Haobam
60. Sapam Nirva Devi
61. Julia Khuraijam
62. Susma Sharma Gurumayum
63. Heisnam Romio Singh
64. Charan Kumar Asem
65. Ngangbam Romia
66. Rajshree Yambem
67. Rajkumari Sanjukta
68. Victoria Huidrom
69. Thokchom Sundaraj Singh
70. O. Poireingamba Khumancha
71. Moirangthem Gautam
72. Irungbam Julius Singh
73. Sonia Haobijam
74. Ningthoujam Nishikanta Singh
75. Yumlembam Paramveer Singh
76. Yumkhaibam Jayalakshmi Devi
77. Tayenjam Clinton Singh
78. Laishram Tarajeet Singh
79. Heisnam Rameshchandra
80. Md. Hefajuddin
81. S. Tryphena Reikhenamai
82. Mohammed Nazmul Huda Khan
83. Michael Fimliensang Fimate
84. PF Lophro
85. Md. Farijuddin Khan
86. Aruw Kayina
87. Kaongamliang Riamei
88. Ramrumpam R. Shimray
89. Kasar Chonchui
90. Robert Lhungdim
91. T. Chinkhansiam
92. Gaishingthui Gangmei
93. Glory Chingthainkim SP
94. Yumnam Dhanendra Singh
95. Maibam Gautam Singh
96. Purbashree Sanglakpam
97. Dinesh Thingom
98. Laikangbam Kherju

… Proforma Respondents

B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LANUSUNGKUM JAMIR
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE KH.NOBIN SINGH

For the petitioners	::	Shri Rarry M., Addl. Advocate General, Shri Julius Riamei, Advocate & Shri B.R Sharma, Advocate
For the Respondents	::	Shri R.S. Reisang, Sr. Advocate. Shri R.K. Deepak, Advocate; Shri Y. Nirmolchand, Sr. Advocate; Shri S. Biswajit Meitei, Advocate & Mrs. G. Pushpa, Advocate.
Date of Hearing	::	**04-12-2020 & 07-12-2020**
Date of Judgment & Order	::	**17-12-2020**

JUDGMENT AND ORDER

Kh. Nobin Singh, J.

[1] Heard Shri M. Rarry, learned Addl. Advocate General, Shri Julius Riamei, learned Advocate and Shri B.R. Sharma, learned Advocate appearing for the review petitioners; Shri R.S. Reisang, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the Manipur Public Service Commission; Shri R.K. Deepak, learned Advocate, Smt. G. Pushpa, learned Advocate, Shri Y. Nirmolchand, learned Senior Advocate and Shri S. Biswajit Meitei, leraned Advocate appearing for the private respondents.

[2] There are altogether 10 (ten) review petitions which are categorized into two groups-one, review petitions filed by the State Government and two, review petitions filed by the successful candidates. These review petitions are directed against the common judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 passed by this Court in writ appeals being WA

No.19 of 2017; WA No.29 of 2017 and writ petitions being WP(C) No.606 of 2017; WP(C) No.725 of 2017 and WP(C) No.313 of 2018. Since the issues involved herein are identical, all the review petitions are considered together and disposed of by this common judgment and order.

[3.1] Facts and circumstances which have led to the filing of the present review petitions are, in short, that the Manipur Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**the MPSC**" issued a Notification dated 29-12-2015, followed by a fresh Notification dated 07-04-2016 inviting applications from amongst the eligible candidates for the Manipur Civil Services Combined Competitive Examination, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as "**the Examination, 2016**") for filling up 82 posts of different categories of service as mentioned therein. The Preliminary Examination, 2016 was held on 03-07-2016 and the result thereof was declared on 08-07-2016 whereby 1130 were declared successful and the Main Examination, 2016 was commenced from 04-09-2016 and continued till 23-09-2016 and the result thereof was declared on 04-10-2016.

[3.2] Being aggrieved by the recruitment process, two writ petitions being WP(C) No.803 of 2016 and WP(C) No.817 of 2017 came to be filed by the petitioners therein questioning its validity and correctness praying inter-alia for quashing the Main Examination, 2016 and for instituting a High Level Committee to investigate into the manner in which the Main Examination, 2016 was conducted by the MPSC on various allegations, some of which are that some of the candidates were provided with extra sheets contrary to the instructions; that the result of the Main Examination

2016 was declared in haste on 04-10-2016 within 11 days from the date of final examination which is unreasonable; that the MPSC did not follow the provisions of the Manipur Public Service Commission (Procedure and Conduct of Business) Rules, 2011 (hereinafter referred to "**the MPSC Conduct Rules, 2011**"); that there was no moderation or scaling of marks as per law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The stand of the MPSC was that since the examination was conducted in terms of the Competitive Examination Rules, 2010, it could complete the process of evaluation of the answer sheets within a short time by engaging more manpower. In the affidavit filed on behalf of the private respondent Nos.4 to 18, it was stated that it was wrong on the part of the petitioners to presume that the result of the Main Examination, 2016 could not have been declared on 04-10-2016, when the evaluation had already started on 09-09-2016. It is nowhere mentioned in the MPSC Rules that the Secretary, MPSC could not leave station during the period of examination and could not delegate his power and functions to the concerned competent officials during his absence. There is no provision in the MPSC Rules which prohibits the evaluation of answer scripts by the evaluators who reside outside Manipur. There is no provision in the MPSC Rules which bars the Secretary, MPSC to hand over the charge to the Addl. Secretary, MPSC to look after the duties of the Secretary, MPSC in his absence. When the rules were silent, the implication would be that the MPSC would have the power to exercise its duties in furtherance of its objectives.

[3.3] On 13-10-2016, when WP(C) No.803 of 2016 came up for consideration, the learned Single Judge decided to proceed to examine the evaluation and other co-related processes keeping in mind certain genuine doubts arisen in the minds of the public. A Commission consisting of a Chairman and two members, was appointed to examine all relevant documents including the answer scripts. Three reports dated 13-01-2017 were submitted by the Commission and after reading all the reports, the petitioners therein were of the view that the reports were not unanimous, as they were not judiciously carried out and were unsatisfactory. Being aggrieved by the findings of the reports, WP(C) No.606 of 2017 was filed by them questioning the reports on various grounds including the grounds that the reports were contradictory to each other and that the Commission was not aware of the rules framed by the MPSC.

[3.4] After hearing the learned counsels appearing for the parties at length, the learned Single Judge vide its common judgment and order dated 28-02-2017, dismissed all the three writ petitions mainly on the basis of the reports submitted by the Commission which concluded that on the basis of the materials, there was no undue haste on the part of the MPSC in managing and getting the result of the Main Examination, 2016 announced. The Commission was appointed for a limited purpose and for the satisfaction of this Court only about the credibility of the allegations made in the face of denial by the MPSC. The Commission did not find any material irregularity or indications of manipulation by the officials, functionaries or agents of the MPSC. As regards the points raised by the

petitioners, various observations were made by the learned Single Judge. In fact, the learned Single Judge noticed many irregularities and lapses on the part of the MPSC as is evident from its judgment and order, towards conducting the examination but it did not interfere with the process of recruitment on the ground that the rules were silent as regards the requirement of following thereof by the MPSC and that the MPSC was required to lay down the detailed guidelines. However, the learned Single Judge, while dismissing the writ petitions, granted liberty to the petitioners therein to approach the appropriate forum by observing that after having accessed the marks and answer scripts or answer scripts of the concerned candidates and other information, if the petitioners were able to bring out any patent irregularity in the conduct of the examination, the petitioners could not be debarred from approaching the appropriate forum for redressal of their grievances, in spite of non-interference by it in the those proceedings.

[3.5] Being aggrieved by the judgment and order dated 28-02-2017 passed by the learned Single Judge, the appeals being WA No.19 of 2017 and WA No.29 of 2017 were preferred on the inter-alia grounds that in spite of several anomalies and lapses in the manner of conducting the examination and in the evaluation of the answer scripts, the learned Single Judge declined to interfere with the result of the examination. The Commission appointed by the learned Single Judge did not make any conclusive findings on relevant facts. The learned Single Judge erred in holding that unless such infraction of the rules, irregularity and serious

lapse did not materially affect the examination and/ or had caused grave prejudice to the candidates, the examination process could not be vitiated. The learned Single Judge recognized that there were serious lapses on the part of MPSC in the manner of conducting the Main Examination 2016. The learned Single Judge erred in not appreciating that the MPSC did not frame the rules as required under Rule 26-B to guide the evaluation and tabulation; that the role and duties of the Controller of Examination could not be assigned to the Secretary, MPSC and that the MPSC Rules 2011 did not provide any provision for taking the answer scripts outside Manipur for evaluation.

[3.6] In the meanwhile, the petitioners therein and many other candidates applied to the MPSC for furnishing copies of their answer scripts under the Right to Information Act, 2005 and on receipt thereof, they found several anomalies, patent irregularities and illegalities in the evaluation of answer scripts, as is evident from the copies of the answer scripts of some of them placed on record. Accordingly, the writ petitions being WP(C) No.606 of 2017 & WP(C) No.725 of 2017 came to be filed for quashing the orders dated 22-06-2017 and dated 26-06-2017 issued by the State Government thereby appointing as many as 79 successful candidates to various posts; to hold the Main Examination 2016 afresh and to direct the CBI to investigate into the manner in which the Main Examination, 2016 was held and proceed in accordance with law. The stand of the MPSC as indicated in its affidavit filed on 20-08-2018 was that it had not done any sort of manipulation or tampering of marks favourable

to a candidate and unfavourable to another candidate. The irregularities mentioned in the final report of the Committee might be attributed to human errors or lapses as apparent to every process which is purely bonafide mistakes and unintentional without any malpractices, thereby not affecting the chances of selection and non-selection in the Main Examination, 2016. The Main Examination, 2016 was conducted strictly in accordance with the Competitive Examination Rules, 2010 and the MPSC Conduct of Rules, 2011 and other relevant rules/ guidelines. The stand of the private respondents was that since the petitioners had failed to qualify for the cut-off marks, they had no locus standi to challenge the recruitment process. There was no finding whatsoever of any irregularity or illegality of any kind with regard to the answer sheets of the answering respondents except minor inconsequential aberrations in respect of the respondent Nos. 37, 40 and 54. The result obtained after correcting the mistakes or irregularities, did not change the original position of the selected and non-selected candidates.

[3.7] On 20-11-2017, this Court after hearing the counsels appearing for the parties, constituted a Committee (hereinafter referred to as "**the Committee**") consisting of two persons- one, a retired District & Sessions Judge and two, a retired IAS, to examine the issues mentioned therein and submit a report thereof within forty-five days therefrom. However, the matter was carried to the Hon'ble Supreme Court by the successful candidates, questioning the order dated 20-11-2017, by way of a petition for special leave to appeal being SLP (C) No.37281-82 of 2017 wherein

the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 11-01-2018 directed that the scope of enquiry should be confined to the answer sheets of the candidates who approached the High Court. Accordingly, this Court passed an order dated 19-01-2018 modifying its earlier order dated 20-11-2017. The Committee submitted its report dated 12-03-2018 in respect of the petitioners only, a copy of which was forwarded to the Hon'ble Supreme Court pursuant to its order and after the perusal of the report, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 12-04-2018 permitted the Committee to look into all the answer sheets of all the candidates. Thereafter, the Committee, after holding the enquiry, submitted its final report on 09-07-2018.

[3.8] A writ petition being WP(C) No. 313 of 2018 came to be filed by a petitioner praying for issuing a writ of certiorari to quash and set aside the Main Examination 2016 as there had been patent irregularities in the evaluation and tabulation of his answer scripts for the ends of justice on the ground that in his answer scripts, two glaring irregularities were found by him.

[3.9] The above writ appeals as well as the writ petitions were disposed of by this Court vide its common judgment and order dated 18-10-2019, the relevant paragraphs of which read as under:

> ***"****[19.1] It is not in dispute that in order to conduct the examination, the MPSC Conduct Rules, 2011 have been framed by the MPSC. There may not be a mandatory provision therein that the Controller of Examination shall be appointed by*

the State Government or any other competent authority. But while going through the provisions of the said rules, the appointment of the Controller of Examination is implicit and is indispensable. The duties and functions of the Controller of Examinaion have been specifically prescribed therein, some of which, mention may be made, are that the codification shall be done in the presence of the Controller of Examination who shall be respondsble for its safety custody and secrecy. The strong room shall be under the dual control of the Chairman and the Secretary. The papers relating to codification shall be kept under his safe custody in the strong room which shall be under the dual control of the Chairman and the Secretary. All arrangements for the examination shall be made by the Controller of Examination in consultation with the Secretary. The guidelines for centre Supervisors and the Invigilators shall be prepared and sent by the Controller of Examination with the prior approval of the Secretary. The Controller of Examination shall ensure that fake roll numbers are allotted to each candidate in each paper before the answer-books are provided or dispatched to the examiners for assessment. The number of answer books to be provided or sent to each examiner, shall be fixed by the Controller of Examination. Ordinarily, six weeks time shall be allowed for the return of assessed answer-books by the examiners but the Controller of Examination may, in special circumstances, extend the time by 15 days. The specific provision that the strong room shall be under the dual control of the Chairman and the Secretary, is very important and significant for the reason that it makes it very clear that the Controller of Examination and the Secretary shall be two different persons. The rational behind it, appears to be that since the Secretary is in charge of the general administration surrounded by many staff, the task of conducting a fair

examination shall be entrusted to the Controller of Examination to maintain a confidentiality and secrecy. The system of keeping documents in a safe custody involving more than one person as is being adopted by the commercial banks, has been contemplated in the said rules. In other words, no one can have any access to the documents without the knowledge and help of the other persons. In the case of the MPSC, no one can have access to the documents without the common knowledge and help of the Controller of Examination, the Chairman and the Secretary. The Controller of Examination alone cannot have access to the documents without the help of the Chairman and the Secretary because the keys of the strong room are with them. Similarly, the Chairman and the Secretary cannot have access to the documents without the key of the almirah/ boxes in which the documents are kept by the Controller of Examination. In the present case, the Controller of Examination was not appointed at all and the Secretary, MPSC was given the additional charge of the Controller of Examination with the result that the object sought to be achieved by the rules, has not been fulfilled at all. In other words, the non-appointment of the Controller of Examination has defeated the very purpose of the examination to be conducted by the MPSC and consequently, the examination to be conducted in a fair manner by it has been thrown in the wind. Despite the fact that the said rules were framed in the year, 2011, leave alone the year in which the MPSC was established for the first time long back, it is not known as to what prevented either the State Government or the MPSC to appoint the Controller of Examination. What is the motive behind it, is best known to the State Government or the MPSC, as the case may be. One can imagine as to what would have happened to an examination being conducted by the MPSC

without a full time Controller of Examination being appointed by it. The non-appointment of the Controller of examination appears to be a means by which the MPSC or for that matter, its staff and officials can take the opportunity of indulging in manipulation, malpractices, unfair means, etc. The appointment of a Controller of Examination which is indispensable for a fair conduct of examination, is not a difficult task, if really desired by the MPSC. The non-appointment of Controller of Examination by itself may not be a ground to vitiate the process of selection but it is definitely one of the factors to be taken into consideration.

[19.2] Although it has been envisaged in the rules that the procedure shall be laid down by the MPSC for the evaluation and tabulation of answer books or sheets as the case may be. The contention of the petitioners is that no such a procedure has been laid down by the MPSC and this seems to be correct for the reason that no document in support of the procedure being laid down by the MPSC, has been placed on record. In any examination conducted by the MPSC, the evaluation and the tabulation of marks in the answer sheets are the most important and crucial stages, any commission of mistakes or error of which during these stages, will make a lot of difference while deciding the fate of a candidate. It is at these stages that the maximum care and caution will have to be taken by the MPSC and in particular, the person/ authority concerned who are involved therein. The conduct of examination is the sole task assigned to the MPSC by the provisions of law enacted by the State Government and therefore, the MPSC being an institution, ought to conduct it after following certain norms. Any exercise of power by the Governmental authorities including the MPSC without following the procedure prescribed in law is

bad. In the present case, since the procedure as regards the evaluation and tabulation of answer sheets, has not been laid down by the MPSC, many irregularities have been committed by it, one of which being that there is no record of handing over and taking over of answer sheets. In the absence of such a record, it is not clear as to who handed over the answer sheets to the examiner; to whom the answer sheets have been handed over; when the answer sheets have been handed over and when the answer sheets have been returned to the MPSC by the examiner. The records of these stages are to be maintained by the MPSC to prevent any room of manipulation. Since the procedure has not been laid down by the MPSC, it appears to have given licence to the examiner to do whatever he feels like. It is not clear as to how the answer sheets were evaluated in the office of the MPSC and it is not in dispute that one examiner had taken answer sheets to his home outside Manipur for evaluation. Some of the examiners are said to have sat for about 13 hours continuously with a break of an hour or so for lunch while the answer sheets were being evaluated at the office of the MPSC. This arrangement continued for about seven days. The office hour of the MPSC is, probably, upto 5 p.m and only the God would know what would have happened thereafter. It has been reported that the Secretary, MPSC had taken some answer sheets for evaluation outside the State. While the evaluation was going on, the scrutiny and decoding was commenced simultaneously and that too, in the office of the MPSC where there is no proper room for doing it and at that point of time, 400-500 candidates did come to the MPSC to sit for the examination. Such things might have been allowed by the MPSC to happen because there is no procedure to be followed by it which has kept the room opened for manipulation. It has been stated in the affidavit of the MPSC

that the answer sheets were evaluated at the office of the MPSC except in respect of some papers which were taken outside Manipur for evaluation. There is no material on record to show as to which answer sheets had been taken outside the State for evaluation by the Secretary, MPSC. The MPSC being an institution, the decision taken by it in such important matter should have been a collective one and no material has been placed on record to show that a decision was taken by the MPSC to authorize the Secretary to take out answer sheets outside the State for evaluation. Even a copy of the letter formally addressed to the examiner/ evaluator, who resides outside the State, requesting him to evaluate the answer sheets, was not produced for perusal by this Court. Without such a formal letter of authority, no payment could be made officially to him by the MPSC for the work done by him. Contrary to what has been stated by the MPSC in its affidavit, it has been stated in the report of the Commission that as has been stated above, one of the examiners who evaluates the paper 'General Studies', had taken home about 300-400 answer sheets for evaluation. Was he authorized by the MPSC through a decision taken by it, is one of the questions which remains unanswered by the MPSC. These irregularities could have been obviated, had the procedure been laid down by the MPSC in time. From these irregularities, it is evident that non-laying down the procedure is fatal, so far as the process of selection is concerned.

[19.3] The irregularities detected by the Committee in its report dated 12-03-2018 are not in dispute amongst the parties except the respondent No.24 whose counsel submitted that an error had crept in the report of the Committee in respect of him and that the same might be expunged by this Court. As the details

of the report having been mentioned hereinabove, the same are not reproduced herein for the sake of brevity. But the irregularities are many and alarming. There are many cases of marks being decreased or increased in the totaling and in respect of the petitioner in WP(C) No.313 of 2018, the allegation was that 88 marks which are huge in number for such an examination, were not added in the calculation of his total marks. The alteration of marks had been done without the initials of the examiner. Many of the answer sheets were not signed either by the invigilator or by the Supervisor or by the Examiner. There are answer sheets in which marks were not given for the answers but had been shown in the tabulation of marks in the front page of the answer sheets. These irregularities could have been rectified, if there was a proper scrutiny being carried out by the MPSC. It has been stated in the affidavit of the MPSC that the scrutiny was done with the help of the lecturers from different colleges and the higher secondary schools. How many lecturers were engaged by the MPSC is not made known to this Court and any decision taken in that regard by the MPSC is also not known to this Court because no material had been produced by it. In fact, the averments made in the affidavit filed on behalf of the MPSC without referring to any decision or document, is not acceptable to this Court. The averments made in their affidavit have been contradicted in the reports submitted by the Commission or the Committee. It is unbelievable that when the scrutiny was carried out by the lecturers, the aforesaid irregularities could have not been detected by them at all. That itself shows the quality or the standard of scrutiny that the MPSC maintains and in other words, the scrutiny may have been done for the namesake only so that the result could be declared at an early done. But the MPSC appears to have forgotten that such

problems might arise in future. One aspect that needs to be considerd by this Court is that even though the evaluation of the last subject was concluded only on 03-10-2016, the result of the Main Examinaton, 2016 was declared on the next day itself. It is hard to believe that the scrutiny would have been carried out in few hours prior to the declaration of the result and that too, in the night. There is a possibility of the select list being kept ready by the MPSC since the result was to be declared in the morning of the next day. The stage of scrutiny is also one of the important and essential stages through which the mistakes or errors that have crept in during the stages of evaluation and tabulation, could have been rectified by the MPSC. Had the scrutiny been done in a proper manner and sincerely, many of the irregularities as detected in the report of the Committee, could have been rectified and removed by the MPSC.

[19.4] In the Notification dated 04-03-2016 issued by the DP, Government of Manipur which was uploaded in the website of the MPSC only on 04-09-2016, the marks fixed by the MPSC in the Main Examination, 2016 for screening of candidates in General English was 40%, while that of the UPSC is only 25%. The contention of the petitioners is that it was contrary to the decision of this Court rendered in H. Bobby Sharma Vs. MPSC, WP(C) No.150 of 2013. If such an order had really been passed by the High Court, the MPSC was duty bound to comply with it. As per the instructions printed on the answer scripts, it has been specifically provided that no extra sheets will be provided at any circumstance but in some centers, the candidates were allowed to take extra sheets. This is contrary to the instructions given to the candidates. The stand of the MPSC is that it was announced in the centres that the extra-sheets would be provided to the

candidates but no materials had been placed on record to show that a decision was taken by the MPSC in that regard.

The moderation or scalling the marks were not adopted by the MPSC which is violative of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. It may be noted that in the absence of any specific rules, the vacuum could have been filled up by the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its decisions. The report given by the Commission is to the effect that one of the expert evaluators who was employed for evaluation of the paper 'Essay', had taken 300-400 answer booklets to his home town for evaluation. It is nowhere mentioned about it in the affidavit filed by the MPSC, rather a vague averment was made to the effect that in respect of some papers, the Secretary, MPSC took out answer sheets outside the State for the evaluation.

The Secretary, MPSC went out of station from 15-09-2016 to 24-09-2016 taking answer sheets outside the State for evaluation. If that be so, the corollary issue that arises for consideration is as to whether the examination was conducted in the absence of the Secretary-cum-Controller of Examination. No materials have been placed on record in this regard. It has been stated in the affidavit filed on behalf of the selected candidates that there is no rule which prohibits the Secretary from handing over the charge to the Addl. Secretary. It may be correct to that extent that the charge of the Secretary can be handed over to the Addl. Secretary while the Secretary was out of station. But it could not have been done so in respect of the Controller of Examination because there is no post of the Addl/ Deputy Controller of Examiation in the MPSC as is being done in respect of the other institutions like BOSE, COSEM etc. If the keys of the almirah/ boxes as well as that of the strong room, were given to the Addl. Secretary, the secrecy would have been diluted and

moreover, the coding, decoding etc. would have been done by the Addl. Secretary in the absence of the Secretary. In other words, everything was done by the Addl. Secretary during the said ten days towards the conduct of examination namely keeping the answer sheets in his custody; coding of the answer sheets; handing over the answer sheets to the examiner; receiving the answer sheets from the examiner; scrutinizing the answer sheets; decoding the answer sheets etc. which is not contemplated in the rules. The MPSC appears to have taken the examination very lightly, like a child's play, completely forgetting that it would decide and determine the career of a candidate.

The declaration of the result of the Main Examination, 2016 in ten days from the date on which the examination of the last subject was held, is unfortunate. The normal time that can be taken by the examiner for evaluation as prescribed in the rules is six weeks. It may be noted that the said time period might have been prescribed keeping in mind the time required for the evulation of answer sheets. The said time period can be extended by 15 days thereafter at the discretion of the Controller of Examination. It may be for this reason that about two months' time had been taken by the MPSC in declaring the results in respect of the Competitive Examination, 2013 and 2014. What was the need of declaring the result in a haphazard manner and that too, with the said irregularities, is beyond comprehensible.

One of the stands of the MPSC is that while the Main Examination, 2016 was going on in full swing continuously for few days and one of the centres was at MPSC building itself, the coding, evaluation, scrutiny, decoding etc. involving a large number of examiners and the lecturers who were engaged for scrutiny, were started simultaneously at the MPSC building itself and that too, in the absence of the Secretary-cum-Controller of

Examination. It is hard to believe it. Whether it would have been possible to be done in the MPSC building itself with limited staff and limited rooms, is the question which remains unanswered by the MPSC. Had it been done so as contented by the MPSC, it would have become a fish market and the possibility of maintainng the confidentiality of the process of selection being diluted, could have been on the higher side.

[20] The process of selection involves and includes various stages of actions to be taken by the MPSC commencing from the date of notification inviting applications till the declaration of results of the Main Examination, 2016. Appropriate actions are to be taken by the MPSC at every stage in accordance with what has been prescribed in the rules. Although the MPSC Conduct Rules, 2011 were framed as late as in the year, 2011, no Controller of Examination was appointed nor was the procedure laid down by the MPSC for the evaluation and tabulation of answer sheets. This may have been deliberately done by the MPSC for an agenda and motive which is best known to it. It was a serious lapse on the part of the MPSC because of which the aforesaid irregularities had occurred, which would go to the root of the process of selection. If the MPSC Conduct Rules, 2011 were not enough to conduct examinations in a fair manner, the MPSC could have amended them suitably. Since the MPSC was empowered to do so in the Constitution of India, nothing prevented it from doing the needful. But the MPSC failed to do it for the reasons best known to it. From the aforesaid lapses and irregularities, it is quite evident that the process of selection had not been done in a right and just manner and in other words, it had not been done in a fair and reasonable manner which is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The MPSC being an Institution and more particularly, a constitutional body,

ought to act fairly and reasonably. It has been stated by the counsel appearing for the selected candidates that there was no allegation against the selected candidates about their being indulged in malpractices, manipulation, corruption etc. and therefore, by applying the principle of segregation of tainted case from the untainted case, their services should not be disturbed, to which the contention of the counsel appearing for the appellants/ petitioners was/ is that there was no material with them to make such allegations. According to them, they applied under the RTI for furnishing copies of the answer sheets of the selected candidates but the same were/ are denied to them by the MPSC in spite of the fact that the learned Single Judge had issued directions for it, probably, with the idea that the appeals preferred against the judgment and order of the learned Single Judge, in respect of this portion, are pending. Since this Court is of the view that the Main Examination, 2016 cannot be said to be an examination at all, in its true sense, keeping in mind the cummulative effect of the lapses and irregularities and in other words, since it cannot be said to be the examination conducted in a fair and reasonable manner, the question of segregation of tainted cases from the untained cases will not arise at all and the consequence thereof ought to follow. The lapses and irregularities as mentioned hereinabove, will go to the root of the case. So far as the contention of the learned counsel appearing for the selected candidates that there was no allegation of manipulation, malpractices etc. against them or for that matter, against the officials of the MPSC, is concerned, it may be noted that it will be known only after the matter is invested by the police or CBI or any other investigating agencies. Relying upon and emphasizing the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Suprme Court in ***Joginder Pal case*** *(supra), it has been submitted by the Counsel appearing for the selected candidates that the cases of*

the selected candidates shall be segregated from that of the others because no irregularity was found in their answer sheets. As has been observed hereinabove, the segregation is not possible for the reason that the Main Examination, 2016 has not been held in a fair and just manner as is evident from the report of the Committee. It may be noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Joginder Pal*** *case itself has held that an appointment made in violation of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitutiton of India would be void. Moreover, in* ***Krishan Yadav case*** *(supra), it has been held that when the entire selection is stinking, conceived in fraud and delivered in deceit, individual innocence has no place as fraud unravels everything. To put in other words, the entire selection is arbitrary. It is that which is faulted and not the individual candidates. Accordingly, the selection has been set aside. Similar is the case with the present case where the Main Examination, 2016 has been conducted in an unfair and unjust manner and in other words, in view of the lapses and the irregularities, the MPSC might not have done that without a motive, in the sense that its modus operandi is arbitrary and malafide. In any case, the conduct of the Main Examination, 2016 by the MPSC is contrary to the observation made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in* ***Ashok Kumar Yadav*** *case (supra) to the effect that the selection of candidates for the administrative services must be made strictly on merits, keeping in view the various factors which go to make a strong, efficient and people oriented administrator.*

[21.1] As regards the writ appeals, it may be noted that they have been preferred against the common judgment and order passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing the writ petitions. The contentions raised in the said writ petitions have been rejected mainly on the basis of the report submitted by the

Commission and in particular, the findings arrived at by the Commission. But some of the irregularities alleged by the petitioners and found in the said reports of the Commission, were considered by the learned Single Judge but the same were not appreciated properly by it. Firstly, as regards the codification, the learned Single Judge observed that the involvement of nine persons during codification could not be said to be an ideal situation but it did not interfere because the Commission did not come across any undesirable or doubtful aspect in the codification process. Nothing has been mentioned in the affidavit-in-opposition of the MPSC nor indicated in the record as to whether there are any detail guidelines for it. Therefore, it is desirable that proper guidelines are laid down as regards the number of persons to be involved in the codification process and the manner of carrying out the process of codification, decodification etc. as the maintenance of confidentiality is indirectly proportionate to the number of persons engaged. In other words, if more persons are involved, the possibility of compromising confidentiality will be higher. Secondly, on the issue relating to number of answer sheets to be evaluated by an examiner in a day, the learned Single Judge observed that no serious lapse was noticed by the Commissioner to doubt the possibility of scrutinizing large number of answer scripts in such a short period of time and therefore, in absence of any glaring inconsistency or irregularity, to indicate that the examiners did not evaluate properly, this Court could not delve further into this arena of subjective exercise of evaluation and it would not be appropriate for this Court in exercise of power of judicial review. Thridly, as regards the non-announcement by way of written information/ notification that the candidates can take extra sheets, the learned Single Judge agreed with the contention of the petitioners that in absence of a written notification, mere

verbal announcement would not meet the requirement of law. It held that to that extent, it can be said that there had been infraction of the rules. But the issue that arises for consideration by this Court is whether such irregularity and infraction of rules would have the effect of nullifying the examination so held. Any deviation from the laid down rules would not ipso facto result in vitiating the examination process, unless it is shown that such a deviation had materially affected the examination and/or had caused grave prejudice to the candidates. There was no observation in the report that all the successful candidates had been given extra answer sheets which would have indicated an undue advantageous position conferred on them. Fourthly, as regards the contention that there had been no moderation or scaling of marks while evaluating the answer scripts of the candidates which has been also confirmed by the report, the learned Single Judge observed that the system of moderation is optional which can be adopted after in depth analysis, which would require experts' views and the fact that such bodies including the Commission erred or have acted in less than responsible manner in the past, cannot be a reason for exercise of judicial power which would normally be limited to instances of arbitrariness or malafide exercise of power. Fifthly, with reference to sub-rule (xii) of Rule 26-B of the aforesaid rules, the learned Single Judge held that it is not disclosed either in the affidavit-in-opposition nor in the report as to when the Controller of Examination took such decision about the number of answer-books to be provided to each examiner which are to be examined on a single day. Nothing has been brought on record as to the procedure laid down by the Commission for undertaking evaluation and tabulation. The observation made by Dr. P. Milan Khangamcha on the basis of the statement made by the external examiner that he had undertaken the evaluation from around

8:30 a.m. upto 9:30 p.m. daily with lunch breaks of 1/1:30 hours in between for 7 days continuously cannot certainly be said to be an ideal and desirable situation. Such prolonged daily and continuous evaluation was bound to take a toll on the body and mind of the examiner, howsoever, experienced an examiner might be. Therefore, the concern expressed by the petitioners that there could not have been proper evaluation cannot be said to be illogical or a fantastic one and in the realm of imagination. It is indeed a matter of concern for which corrective steps need to be taken by the MPSC. The observation made by Shri B.K. Sharma who had assisted the Commissioner to the effect that in his opinion the outsider evaluator, even though he had a good enough of extra qualifications, did not evaluate the answer scripts with utmost diligence and thus indicated to the lack of satisfaction about the proper evaluation, is certainly a jarring note to the observation of the Commissioner which must be properly addressed to by the MPSC. Sixthly, since the MPSC has not framed any rules about the number of answer scripts an evaluator can scrutinise in a day, it cannot be said that any rule has been violated which would call for interference. Thus, in absence of any rules, it will be difficult to hold that evaluating about 76 answer scripts in a day is illegal per se. Yet, the onus of the MPSC that it has acted in a fair and transparent manner to be discharged is very high, simply for ensuring credibility of its functioning. Since this is not an ideal situation as is also revealed from the report of the Commission, such a situation must be avoided in future. This Court has also noted that the MPSC has not offered any explanation as to what prompted it to proceed at such breakneck speed to complete the evaluation within such a short time. The rules also do not provide that the result of the written examination must be declared within specified days. They have neither offered, nor has the report also mentioned any such

reason which compelled the MPSC to insist on the examiners to evaluate in such a short period of time. The fact that the examiner in Essay had started evaluation around 8:30 a.m. which continued upto 9:00 to 9:30 p.m. daily with lunch breaks of 1 to 1:30 hrs break in between for 7 days cannot be at all said to be an ideal mode of evaluation, which must be avoided in future. Sevently, this Court is of the view that since it is a competitive public examination where the Commission is expected to function in the fair and transparent manner, all endeavours should be made to avoid any situation which would lead to creating any doubt on the functioning of the Commission. Though in the present case no material irregularity had been noticed by the Court appointed Commission, in spite of large number of answer scripts being examined, the room of doubt will always remain as to the quality of evaluation. Therefore, it will be always desirable that to obviate any doubt in future which has caused so much of delay in the finalization of the recruitment process, the MPSC must lay down the norm for fixing the number of answer scripts to be examined by the evaluators. The MPSC may do so in consultation with experts in this field so that neither the examiners are put to undue stress for completing the scrutiny in such short span of time and also to dispel any doubt of improper evaluation. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the MPSC must lay down the procedures in writing in advance and ought not be left to the absolute discretion of any individual functionary as it seems to have been done in the present case which has caused so much uncertainty and suspicion in the mind of the candidates which were all avoidable. Laying down of detail procedure by the MPSC as regards evaluation and tabulation would prevent any scope of arbitrariness or any room for suspicion. The functioning of such an important body like the MPSC can not be left to the absolute discretion of certain

functionaries only. There must be properly laid down guidelines/ instructions to govern these crucial areas of the examination system. Eightly, it is too fundamental not to be noticed that there are certain public institutions like the MPSC whose existence and credibility depends to a large extent on the confidence reposed on these by the public at large. Such public institutions cannot remain satisfied on the mere fact that certain allegations of irregularities leveled against them have not been proved. The fact that serious allegations have been made in the functioning of such institutions, even if not proved, certainly puts a serious dent on the prestige and credibility of such institutions. The allegations raised by the petitioners in these batch of petitions cannot be said to be mere figments of imaginations and illusory. These are allegations which have the potential of seriously damaging the image of the MPSC. Therefore, it is important that those who are involved with the functioning of the MPSC take all the necessary measures not to allow the credibility of such institutions to be undermined by such complaints. After all, the credibility of such public institutions in a democratic society like ours depends to a large extent on the positive public perception of their functioning. Any negative public perception of the functioning would tend to lower the prestige and credibility of such institutions.

[21.2] In spite of the above observations, the learned Single Judge dismissed the writ petitions on the ground that the Commission did not find any irregularity in the process of selection. The Commission was authorised by the leraned Single Judge to examine all the documents and papers and examine with persons, officials or evaluators involved in the entire exercise of evaluation beginning with co-dification upto the final stage of tabulation and declaration of results and the Commissioner could have access to the answer scripts of all the candidates as the Commission considered appropriate including

the answer scripts of all the subjects. The Commissioner vide its report dated 13-01-2017 did not find anything substantial on the basis of which one might reasonably conclude that there had been irregularity or impropriety on the part of the MPSC in getting the result announced speedily. The scope of the enquiry was very wide but it is surprising to note that during the course of enquiry, none of the irregularities which were detected in the subsequent report of the Committee, was found by the Commission. It is not clear as to which answer sheets had been examined by the Commission and if the Commission had really examined the answer sheets of the candidates, there is no reason as to why they could not detect even one irregularity. The Commission appears to have conducted the enquiry in the same manner as the scrutiny was allegedly done by the MPSC. One probability is that during the course of enquiry, only the selective answer sheets which are all right in all aspects which the MPSC knew about it, might have been shown to the Commission. The findings of the Commission which are not based on documents, are mere observations. In view of the findings arrived at by the Committee as aforesaid, the findings arrived at by the Commission can be said to be erroneous; will have no vaue at all and cannot be relied upon at all. Therefore, the judgment and order of the learned Single Judge relying upon the findings arrived by the Commission, will be rendered bad in law and is liable to be set aside. Moreover, from the observations made by the learned Single Judge, it is absolutely clear that the learned Single Judge knew that there might be some irregularities in the process of selection, because of which it gave the liberty to the petitioners to approach the High Court, if they found some irregularities/ illegalities after they had access to the records, otherwise there was no need of granting such liberty after the writ petitions having been dismissed by it.

[22] The MPSC was established in terms of the provisions of Article 320 of the Constitution of India. It is not only a public institution but also a constitutional body entrusted with the solemn task of conducting examinations. The purpose for which the MPSC was established under the provisiosn of Article 315 of the constitution of Inida is to conduct examination and to render services relating to methods of recruitment, the principle to be followed in making appointments etc. The staff or the officials of the MPSC are public servants, whose salaries are paid out of the public money. As mandated in Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, the MPSC ought to act fairly and reasonably and to conduct examinations in a fair and reasonable manner. From the materials on record, the MPSC has miserably failed to discharge its duties properly, sincerely and effectively. It is not only their act of negligence but also deliberate act on its part. The MPSC appears to have proceeded on the footing that it could do whatever it feels like and that nobody could question its bonafide. This Main Examination, 2016 which is considered to be the highest examination in the State, had been conducted for the namesake without any botheration about its outcome. In other words, it has not cared at all about the career of a large number of candidates. It is unfortunate that it has claimed that the irregularities may be attributed to human errors. One or two irregularities can be said to be attributed to human error but the irregularities which are innumerable and alarming, demonstrate the callous attitude of the MPSC in playing with the career and future of the candidates. Considering the lapses and irregularities, no considerate and reasonable man would agree that the Main Examination, 2016 had been conducted in a fair and just manner. This is not the first time that the MPSC has behaved in this fashion and its manner of conducting examination is condemnable. In writ petitions being WP(C)

No.993 of 2014 and other connected matters, the validity and correctness of the process of selection conducted by the MPSC and in particular, the advertisement inviting applications for appointment of 280 Assistant Professors for the Government Colleges in the State, was challenged and while disposing of the said writ petitions with certain directions, this Court vide its judgment and order dated 11-01-2017 had observed as under:

> **"***It is thus clear that the MPSC is either incapable of holding such selection properly or is absolutely irresponsible or negligent in the discharge of its duties. There is hardly any selection/ DPC, conducted by the MPSC, which is not challenged by the aggrieved persons before this court. The MPSC is an institution/ authority constituted under the provisions of Article 315 of the Constitution of India with its function to conduct examinations for appointments to the services of the State Government and it is very unfortunate that the MPSC has failed to discharge its functions effectively and in case it continues to do so, the public will lose its faith in it. It is high time for the MPSC to introspect, to apply its mind and try to improve its functioning to a great extent.***"**

The observations made by this Court hereinabove appear to have fallen on deaf ears of the MPSC which continues to behave in the same fashion. Moreover, it may be noted that the learned Single Judge, while dismissing the writ petitions, had observed that it was the duty of the MPSC to rectify the errors in future before any examination was conducted by it. The MPSC did not bother about it at all and the Manipur Civil Services Combined Competitive Examination, 2019 was commenced by the MPSC with the issuance of an advertisement dated 08-01-2019 but when it was challenged in Nelojit Mayengbam & anr. Vs. Manipur Public Service Commission & ors., W.P. (C) No. 373 of 2019; Namdithiu Moita Vs. State of Manipur & ors., W.P. (C) No. 375 of

2019 & Thounaojam Ropeshtajit Singh & anr. Vs. State of Manipur & anr., W.P. (C) No. 378 of 2019, this Court vide its order dated 10-05-2019 intervened and stayed the process of selection on the ground that the MPSC had failed to implement the observations made by the learned Single Judge and in particular, the non-appointment of the Controller of Examination. In addition to the above, some of such cases are still pending before this Court for disposal. It is the right time for the MPSC or for that matter, its staff or officials to be penalized for their misdeeds which they have been doing for the last many years and if not penalized now, they would continue to do so in future at the cost of public interest and public money.

From the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it can be safely held that the MPSC has no intention to conduct any examination in a fair and just manner. It had, in the present case, miserably failed to discharge its duties and functions as mandated in the Constitution of India. It would like to continue holding examinations, only in name, with a half baked rules so that it could manipulate it. If the MPSC was/ is unable to frame an appropriate and correct rule, it could do so by taking the help from the UPSC or any other State Public Service Commission. There is no harm in doing that. Whenever an allegation is made against the MPSC towards holding of an examination by it, the readymade answer is that the rule is silent on that. For example, it is the stand of the MPSC that the signature of the Supervisor on the answer sheets is not mandatory, even though there is a column specified and earmarked for it therein because the rule does not provide for it and that no prejudice will be caused to the candidates. On a query put to the counsel appearing for the MPSC if there is any provision in the rules which provides that the invigilator and the examiner shall put their signature on the answer sheets, the answer of the counsel is in the negative.

What is the status of such answer sheets is not made known to anyone. The consequence of such answer sheets without the signature of the invigilator or the Supervisor or the Examiner is not indicated in the rules except creating a room for manipulation, replacement etc. and in such a small State like Manipur, the answer sheets can be indentified even after the same being codified, if the answer sheets are evaluated in the manner as has been done in the present case."

Review Petition Nos. 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 of 2020:

[4.1] The above review petitions have been filed by the State Government on the inter-alia grounds that in view of the subsequent and important discovery of new material facts, the judgment and order passed by this Court calls for immediate interference by this Court as the same shocks the judicial conscience. The members of the Committee are interested parties belonging to the unsuccessful candidates and therefore, they cannot be permitted to hold the enquiry against the successful candidates. They had a duty to disclose to all the parties of the present proceedings as well as this Court and should act fairly that their children had appeared in the examination and unsuccessful but they had failed to disclose the details thereof. It is well settled principle of law that no man can be a judge of his own cause. Despite the exercise of due diligence by the State Government, the fact was not within their knowledge and hence, it could not be produced before this Court when the judgment and order was passed by this Court. The successful candidates came to know about it through the RTI and information thereof was furnished to the State Governmet vide their letter dated 23-12-2019. This Court would have

declined to quash the entire Main Examination in the event of the report of the enquiry being set aside as there is no finding of fraud, malpractice, serious irregularity and favouritism of any kind. If the above facts, new and important material evidence, were brought in time, this Court would have never passed this common judgment and order.

Review Petition Nos. 3, 6, 9, 11, 12 of 2020

[4.2] The above review petitions have been filed by the review petitioners who are successful candidates, on the allegations that the members of the fact finding Committee are interested parties in the present case and their interest is to cancel the MCSCCE-2016 so that their children who were unsuccessful candidates, can get unfair second chance. The review petitioners were not aware of the aforesaid fact before passing the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 as the members of the Committee failed to reveal it and therefore, the report submitted by them deserves to be cancelled. The act of the members of the Committee is in clear violation of the principles of natural justice, the rule against bias, i.e., Nemo Judex in Causa Sua, one cannot be a judge on his own cause. Had these facts been placed before the High Court during the proceedings or at the time of hearing, the impugned judgment and order would not have been passed by this Court.

[4.3] Some counter affidavits have been filed by the respondents through their respective advocates and the stand taken by them is almost identical and therefore, the specific and detailed averments made therein are not referred to herein for the sake of brevity. Their stand is that the

review petitions are liable to be dismissed, as the same are devoid of any merit only on the ground that they failed to demonstrate that there is an error apparent on the face of the record which cannot be fished out and searched. A review petition has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be filed like an appeal in disguise.

[4.4] The stand of the MPSC as indicated in its affiadavit filed in review petition No.4 of 2020 is that the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 passed by this Court was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of a petition for special leave to appeal vide Diary No.3951 of 2019 wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while dismissing it, passed an order dated 22-11-2019 directing the MPSC to hold the main examination afresh as early as possible and in addition thereto, the Hon'ble Supreme Court made it very clear that it had not commented anything with regard to CBI investigation. A review petition is by no means an appeal in disguise and its scope is very restricted. The discovery of new evidence as alleged by the review petitioners, cannot be a ground for review, as the children of the member of the Committee were not allowed to sit for the Main Examination, 2016. After the dismissal of the said SLPs by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the MPSC in its full meeting held on 14-08-2020 decided to hold the examination tentatively in the month of October/ November, 2020 for which a notification was issued on the same day, followed by a notification dated 27-08-2020. The review petition is not maintainable, as the impugned judgment and order has been acted upon by it. But in its rejoinder, it has been stated by the State Government that it can never be claimed that this Court has directed the MPSC to conduct

examination from the stage of mains only and not prelims. The MPSC has taken a stand contrary to that of its stand taken in the affidavit dated 20-080-2018. The contention of the MPSC is misconceived, as the members of the Committee who are the fathers of two unsuccessful candidates, can never be said to be neutral and their appointment is in breach of the principles of natural justice.

[5] In **Kamlesh Verma Vs. Mayawati & Ors., (2013) 8 SCC 320,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while considering the issue as to whether the review petitioner therein has made out a case for reviewing the judgment and order and satisfies the criteria for reviewing the same in review jurisdiction, had considered the scope of the review jurisdiction. After referring to its earlier decisions, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held:

> *"20. Thus, in view of the above, the following grounds of review are maintainable as stipulated by the statute:*
>
> *20.1. When the review will be maintainable:*
>
> *(i) Discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within knowledge of the petitioner or could not be produced by him;*
> *(ii) Mistake or error apparent on the face of the record;*
> *(iii) Any other sufficient reason.*
>
> *The words "any other sufficient reason" have been interpreted in* ***Chhajju Ram v. Neki*** *and approved by this Court in* ***Moran Mar Basselios Catholicos v. Most Rev. Mar Poulose Athanasius*** *to mean "a reason sufficient on grounds at least analogous to those specified in the rule". The same principles have been reiterated* ***in Union of India v. Sandur Manganese & Iron Ores Ltd.***

20.2. When the review will not be maintainable:

(i) A repetition of old and overruled argument is not enough to reopen concluded adjudications.

(ii) Minor mistakes of inconsequential import.

(iii) Review proceedings cannot be equated with the original hearing of the case.

(iv) Review is not maintainable unless the material error, manifest on the face of the order, undermines its soundness or results in miscarriage of justice.

(v) A review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is reheard and corrected but lies only for patent error

(vi) The mere possibility of two views on the subject cannot be a ground for review.

(vii) The error apparent on the face of the record should not be an error which has to be fished out and searched.

(viii) The appreciation of evidence on record is fully within the domain of the appellate court, it cannot be permitted to be advanced in the review petition.

*(ix) Review is not maintainable when the same relief sought at the time of arguing the main matter had been negative***".**

The above decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been referred to and relied upon by this Court in many cases. On top of that, it has been referred to by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in one of its recent decision rendered in **Akshay Kumar Singh Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), (2020) 3 SCC 431** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that it is no longer res intrega that the scope of review is limited and review cannot be entertained except in case of error apparent on the face of the record. Review is not a rehearing of the appeal over again. In a review petition, it

is not for the Court to re-appreciate the evidence and reach a different conclusion.

[6] Before adverting to the rival contentions of the parties, it may be appropriate for this Court to examine as to what are the principles of '**Natural justice**' and what are its extent and scope. Natural justice is an important concept in administrative law. It is not possible to define precisely and scientifically the expression 'natural justice'. It is, like the doctrine of ultra vires and public policy, is a branch of public law. The law is settled after the powerful pronouncement of Byles, J in **Cooper Vs. Wandsworth Board of Works** wherein it has been held that although there are no positive words in the statute requiring that the party shall be heard, yet the justice of the common law will apply the omission of the legislature. The above principle is accepted in India also. In the case of **A.K. Karaipak Vs. Union of India, (1969) 2 SCC 262**, the Supreme Court propounded:

> ***"****The aim of the rules of natural justice is to secure justice or to put negatively to prevent miscarriage of justice. These rules can operate in areas not covered by any law validly made. In other words, they do not supplant the law of the land but supplement it****".***

In **Maneka Gandhi Vs. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248**, the Supreme Court observed:

> **"***It is well established that even where there is no specific provision in a statute or rules made thereunder for showing cause against action proposed to be taken against an individual, which affects the right of that individual the duty to give*

*reasonable opportunity to be heard will be implied from the nature of the functions to be performed by the authority which has the power to take positive or damaging actions.**"***

"The rigid view that the principles of natural justice applied only to judicial and quasi-judicial acts and not to administrative acts no longer holds the filed".

In **Mohinder Singh Gill Vs. Chief Election Commissioner, (1978) 1 SCC 405**, Krishna Iyer, J says:

"**indeed, from the legendary days of Adam- and of Kautilya Arthashastra- the rule of law has had this stamp of natural justice which makes it social justice**".

The expression "civil consequences" used in **National Textile Workers' Union Vs. PR Ramakrishnan, (1983) 1 SCC228** has not been defined. But in Mohinder Singh Gill case, Krishna Iyer, J observed:

"**In its comprehensive connotation, everything that affects a citizen in his civil life inflicts a civil consequence**".

In **Sahara India (Firm) Vs. CIT, (2008) 14 SCC 151**, the Supreme Court held that with the growth of administrative law, the old distinction between judicial act and administrative act has withered away. Today, even a pure administrative action entailing civil consequences must be consistent with the rules of natural justice.

In **Union of India Vs. PK Roy, AIR 1968 SC 850**, the Supreme Court observed:

"The extent and application of the doctrine of natural justice can not be imprisoned within the straitjacket of a rigid formula".

Similarly in A.K. Kairakpak (supra), the Supreme Court observed that what a particular rule of natural justice should apply to a given case must depend to a great extent on the facts and circumstances of that case. In **Canara Bank Vs. V.K. Awasthy, (2005) 6 SCC 321**, after referring to several decisions, the Hon'ble Supreme Court sated:

"Principles of natural justice are those rules which have been laid down by the Courts as being the minimum protection of the rights of the individual against the arbitrary procedure that may be adopted by a judicial, quasi-judicial and administrative authority while making an order affecting those rights. These rules are intended to prevent such authority from doing injustice".

In **Dev Dutt Vs. Union of India, (2008) 8 SCC 725**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the rules of natural justice are not codified nor are they unvarying in all situations, rather they are flexible.

In **Ashok Kumar Sonkar Vs. Union of India, (2007) 4 SCC 54,** one of the issues involved therein was as regards the compliance with the principles of natural justice and the Hon'ble Supreme Court held:

"26. This brings us to the question as to whether the principles of natural justice were required to be complied with. There cannot be any doubt whatsoever that the audi alteram partem is one of the basic pillars of natural justice which means no one should be condemned unheard. However, whenever possible the principle of natural justice should be followed. Ordinarily in a case of this nature the same should be complied with. Visitor may in a given

situation issue notice to the employee who would be effected by the ultimate order that may be passed. He may not be given an oral hearing, but may be allowed to make a representation in writing.

27. It is also, however, well settled that it cannot put any straitjacket formula. It may not be applied in a given case unless a prejudice is shown. It is not necessary where it would be a futile exercise.

28. A court of law does not insist on compliance with useless formality. It will not issue any such direction where the result would remain the same, in view of the fact situation prevailing or in terms of the legal consequences. Furthermore in this case, the selection of the appellant was illegal. He was not qualified on the cut-off date. Being ineligible to be considered for appointment, it would have been a futile exercise to give him an opportunity of being heard."

In **P.D Dinakaran (I) Vs. Judges Enquiry Committee & ors, (2011) 8 SCC 380**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held:

"31 The consideration of the aforesaid question needs to be prefaced by a brief reference to the nature and scope of the rule against bias and how the same has been applied by the courts of common law jurisdiction in India for invalidating judicial and administrative actions/orders. Natural justice is a branch of public law. It is a formidable weapon which can be wielded to secure justice to citizens. Rules of natural justice are "basic values" which a man has cherished throughout the ages. Principles of natural justice control all actions of public authorities by applying rules relating to reasonableness, good faith and justice, equity and good conscience. Natural justice is a part of law which relates to administration of justice.

Rules of natural justice are indeed great assurances of justice and fairness. The underlying object of rules of natural justice is to ensure fundamental liberties and rights of subjects. They thus serve public interest. The golden rule which stands firmly established is that the doctrine of natural justice is not only to secure justice but to prevent miscarriage of justice."

In **Poonam Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & ors., (2016) 2 SCC 779**, after referring to its earlier decisions and in particular, **Sadananda Halo Vs. Mumtaz Ali Sheikh, (2008) 4 SCC 616**, the Hon"ble Supreme Court held:

20. In this context the authority in Sadananda Halo Vs. Mumtaz Ali Sheikh is quite pertinent. The Divisin Bench referred to the decision in All India SC & ST Employees Assn. V. A. Arthur Jeen wherein this Court had addressed the necessity of joining the necessary candidates as parties. The Court referred to the principle of natural justice as enunciated in Canara Bank V. Debasis Das. We may profoundly reproduce the same:

"63. ..Natural justice has been variously defined. It is another name for common sense justice. Rules of natural justice are not codified canons. But they are principles ingrained into the conscience of man. Natural justice is the administration of justice in a common sense liberal way. Justice is based substantially on natural ideals and human values. The administration of justice is to be freed from the narrow and restricted considerations which are usually associated with a formulated law involving linguistic technicalities and grammatical niceties. It is the substance of justice which has to determine its form. Principles of natural justice are those rules which have been laid down by the courts as being the

minimum protection of the rights of the individual against the arbitrary procedure that may be adopted by a judicial, quasijudicial and administrative authority while making an order affecting those rights. These rules are intended to prevent such authority from doing injustice.' (Debasis Das case26, SCC pp. 560h-561a)"

And again: (Sadananda Halo case, p. 648, para 63)

"63. …Concept of natural justice has undergone a great deal of change in recent years. Rules of natural justice are not rules embodied always expressly in a statute or in rules framed thereunder. They may be implied from the nature of the duty to be performed under a statute. What particular rule of natural justice should be implied and what its context should be in a given case must depend to a great extent on the facts and circumstances of that case, the framework of the statute under which the enquiry is held. The old distinction between a judicial act and an administrative act has withered away. The adherence to principles of natural justice as recognised by all civilised States is of supreme importance…' (Debasis Das case, SCC p. 561e-f)"

21. We have referred to the aforesaid passages as they state the basic principle behind the doctrine of natural justice, that is, no order should be passed behind the back of a person who is to be adversely affected by the order. The principle behind the proviso to Order 1 Rule 9 that the Code of Civil Procedure enjoins it and the said principle is also applicable to the writs. An unsuccessful candidate challenging the selection as far as the service jurisprudence is concerned is bound to make the selected candidates parties".

[7.1] The submissions of Shri M. Rarry, the learned Addl. Advocate General appearing for the State of Manipur, the review petitioners are that after the SLPs had been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the State Government came to know that the members of the Committee costituted by this Court failed to disclose that their chidren had appeared in the Preliminary Examination; that it was a fraud played on this Court and that since it is a new fact/ evidence, the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 passed by this Court on the basis of its report, is liable to be reviewed by this Court. This Court would have declined to quash the entire Main Examination, 2016 in the event of the report being set aside, as there is no finding of fraud, malpractice, serious irregularity and favoritism of any kind in the record of the case. In support of his contention, reliance has been placed by him on the decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ashok Kumar Yadav & ors Vs. State of Haryana & ors, (1985) 4 SCC 417; M/s R.B Sreeram Durga Prasad and Fatechand Nursing Das Vs. Settlement Commissioner (IT & WT) & anr, (1989) 1 SCC 628; Chandra Shashi Vs. Anil Kumar Verma, (1995) 1 SCC 421; Lily Thomas Vs. Union of India & ors, (2000) 6 SCC 224; Zahira Habibulla H. Sheikh & anr Vs. State of Gujarat &ors, (2004) 4 SCC 158; Board of Control for Cricket in India Vs. Netajit Cricket Clb & ors, (2005) 4 SCC 741; Hanza Haji Vs. State of Kerala & anr, (2006) 7 SCC 416; A.V Papayya Sastry & ors Vs. Govt. of AP & ors, (2007) 4 SCC 221; K.D Sharma Vs. Steel Authority of India & ors, (2008) 12 SCC 481; Uma Nath Pandey & ors Vs. State of Uttar Paradesh & anr, (2009) 12 SCC 40; State of Chhatisgarh & ors Vs. Dhirjo Kumar Sengar, (2009) 13**

SCC 600; Babubhai Vs. State of Gujarat & ors, (2010) 12 SCC 254; P.D Dinakaran (I) Vs. Judges Enquiry Committee & ors, (2011) 8 SCC 380; Azija Begum Vs. State of Maharastra & anr, (2012) 3 SCC 126; Dayal Singh & ors Vs. State of Uttaranchal, (2012) 8 SCC 263; State of Gujarat & anr Vs. Justice R.A Mehta & ors, (2013)1 SCC 1; Subramanian Swamy Vs. Director, CBI & ors, (2014) 8 SCC 682; Dharampal Satyapal Limited Vs. Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise, Gauhati & ors, (2015) 8 SCC 519; Khoday Distilleries Limited & ors Vs. Sri Mahadeshwara Sahakara Sakkare Karkhane Limited , (2019) 4 SCC 376.

Shri Julius Riamei, learned Advocate for the other review petitioners has submitted that he would adopt the submissions of the learned Addl. Advocate General and in addition thereto, it has been submitted by him that the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 was passed by this Court in violation of the principles of natural justice warranting interference of this Court to review it for the reason that the members of the Committee did not disclose or inform that their children were unsuccessful candidates and that the said judgment and order was based on their report. He has relied upon the decisions rendered in an English case, **R. v. Bow Sttreet Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrtae, ex p Pinochet Ugarte, (1999) 2 WLR 272: (1999) 1 ALL ER 577 (HL)**, relied upon by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.D Dinakaran Vs. Judges Inquiry Committee, (2011) 8 SCC 380** and **Rupa Ashok Hurra Vs. Ashok Hurra, (2012) 4 SCC 388**.

[7.2] Combating the above submissions made by the counsels appearing for the review petitioners, it has been submitted by Shri R.K Deepak, the learned Advocate appearing for some of the respondents that the review petitions are not maintainable for the reason that the Hon'ble Supreme Court being conscious of the findings of the report, dismissed the SLPs filed against the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 with reasons and observations and that if it is reviewed by this Court, it would amount to interfering with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. If the review petitioners wished to file the review petitions, the same ought to have been filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court to review its order. Assuming that the review petitions are maintainable, the review petitioners ought to have acted with due diligence and should have filed the review petitions much earlier which they utterly failed. Since the Committee was to give only an objective assessment and not the subjective assessment, the members of the Committee might not be thinking that they would disclose to the Court that their children had appeared and failed in the Preliminary Examination. The judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 is not liable to be reviewed for the reason that it was not passed by this Court only on the basis of the findings of the report but was passed considering all the irregularities, illegalities and the lapses on the part of the MPSC. By way of a supplement, Smt. G. Pushpa, learned Advocate appearing for some of the respondents has submitted that the State Government which is not aggrieved by the impugned judgment and order dated 18-10-2019, filed the review petitions in collusion with the successful candidates for the reason that Shri M. Rarry, the learned Addl. Advocate General who was

the counsel for some of the successful candidates, filed the review petitions on behalf of the State Government. In the CA No. 3725-53/2018 filed by the successful candidates before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, by way of a petition for special leave to appeal which was granted, challenging the order dated 20-11-2017 constituting the Committee, the State Government was represented by its counsel which would show that it was aware of the order dated 12-04-2018 passed by the Hon'ble Syupreme Court. It is nowhere pointed in the review petitions that the members of the Committee had acted bias, arbitrarily or capriciously. The review petitions ought to be dismissed as they had been filed after more than two years from the date of constitution of the Committee, for which she has relied upon a decision dated 03-11-2020 rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ram Sahu (dead), through LRs & ors Vs. Vinod Kumar Rawat & ors** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court, referring to its earlier decision in **Haridas Das Vs. Usha Rani Banik(Smt.) & ors, (2006) 4 SCC 78**, considered the scope of the review petition. Shri S. Biswajit Meitei, learned Advocate appearing for some of the respondents has supplemented by submitting that the filing of review petitions by the review petitioners is an attempt to re-hear the matter on merit in the form of an appeal. The review petition can be filed on the basis of error apparent on the face of record and not on those which need to be fished out and subsequent events arisen after passing the judgment and order are relevant only for equitable relief and not for review. The State Government has made an attempt to mislead this Court by pleading wrong facts and blatant lie stating that some of the petitioners in WP(C) No.803 of 2016 &

WP(C) No.817 of 2016 had not cleared the Preliminary Examination; they had challenged the earlier Enqury Commission only after the dismissal thereof and that the children of the members of the Committee had failed in the Main Examination which may amount to perjury and criminal contempt. The review petitions should be dismissed only on the ground of giving false statement in the affidavit. The findings of the Committee will remain the same, even if the answer sheets are re-examined and re-verified by somebody because the same are based on the records. He has relied upon the decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***(1980) 2 SCC 167; State of Rajasthan Vs. Ram Chandra, M/s. Northern India Caterers (India) Ltd. Vs. Lt. Governor of Delhi, (2005) 5 SCC 151; Kamlesh Verma Vs. Mayawati & Ors., (2013) 8 SCC 320; Mukesh Singh Vs. State (Narcotic Branch of Delhi), SPL (Crl) Diary No.39528 of 2018 decided on 31-08-2020 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.*** The submissions made by Shri Y. Nirmolchand, Senior Advocate for some of the respondents are similar to that of the above Advocates and therefore, the same are not repeated here for the sake of brevity. Reliance has been placed by him in **Sivakami & ors Vs. State of Tamil Nadu & ors, (2018) 4 SCC 587**. Similar is the case with Shri R.S Raisang, Senior Advocate who has relied upon the decision rendered in **Sushil Kumar Vs. Rakesh Kumar, (2003) 8 SCC 671**.

[8] An objection as regards the maintainability of the review petiions has been raised by the counsel appearing for the respondents mainly on the ground that the petition for special leave to appeal being SLP (C) Diary NO.39519/2019 with SLP(C) No.27466-68/2019 and SLP(C) No.27560-

62/2019 preferred by the successful candidates had been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and that the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 had attained its finality. Relying upon the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Khoday Distilleries Limited & ors Vs. Sri Mahadeshwara Sahakara Sakkare Karkhane Limited, (2019) 4 SCC 376**, it has been submitted by the learned Addl. Advocate General that since the SLPs had been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in limine, the instant review petitions are maintainable. In Khoday Distilleries Ltd (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court while affirming and reiterating the conclusions rendered in **Kunhayammed Vs. State of Kerala, (2000) 6 SCC 359**, summed up them, one of which being that if the order refusing leave to appeal is a speaking order, ie., gives reasons for refusing the grant of leave, then the order has two implications-one, the statement of law is a declaration of a law within the meaning of Article 141 of the Constitution and two, whatever is stated in the order are the findings which would bind the parties. In fact, there can be no any dispute as regards the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the said decision rendered in Khoday Distilleries (supra) and there are instances where this Court had entertained review petitions after the SLP being dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in limine. But on perusal of the said order dated 22-11-2019 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is of the opinion that the dismissal was not in limine and it was more than that because the reasons for dismissal of the said SLPs had been given and moreover, certain observations had been made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court while dismissing it. The contention of the learned Addl. Advocate General as well

as that of other advocates appearing for other review petitioners appears to be incorrect in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case and therefore, the review petitions cannot be said to be maintainable.

[9] Even though the review petitions are found to be not maintainable, this Court proposes to consider the review petitions on merit, since the counsels appearing for the parties have made their submissions on merit as well. It may be noted that the contentions of the learned counsels appearing for the review petitioners are not unanimous except the allegation that the members of the Committee had not disclosed that their children had appeared in the Preliminary Examination. It may further be noted that their children had failed in the Preliminary Examination, because of which they did not participate in the Main Examination, 2016. It has been submitted by the learned Addl. Advocate General that the members of the Committee had failed to disclose the material facts; that they could not be said to be fair and independent; that they had played fraud on this Court and that the appointment of the Committee was in violation of the principles of natural justice as is evident from the rejoinder. It has been submitted by Shri Julius Riamei, learned Advocate that the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 was passed by this Court in violation of the principles of natural justice because the members of the Committee constituted by this Court had failed to inform the Court that their children were unsuccessful candidates in the MCSCCE-2016. It has been stated in the review petitions filed by the successful candidates through their counsel, Shri B.R. Sharma, learned Advocate that the act of the members of the Committee was in clear violation of the principles of

natural justice, the rule against bias, i.e., Nemo Judex in Causa Sua, one cannot be a judge on his own cause. Their submissions, if read together, appear to have shown their lack of understanding the principles of natural justice. As has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the decisions referred to hereinabove, the principles of natural justice are not codified law and are those rules which have been laid down by the Courts that may be adopted by a judicial, quasi-judicial and administrative authority while making an order. The extent and application of the principles of natural justice cannot be imprisoned within the straitjacket of a rigid formula. What a particular rule of natural justice should apply to a given case must depend upon, to a great extent, on the facts and circumstances of that case. The principles of natural justice are intended to prevent such authority from doing injustice. Considering the materials on record and having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties, this Court is of the view that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the instant review petitions are devoid of merit and are liable to be dismissed for the following reasons:

(a) The judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 passed by this Court had attained its finality after the petition for special leave to appeal being SLP (C) Diary No. 39519/2019 with SLP (C) No.27466-68/2019 and SLP(C) No. 27560-62/2019, filed by the successful candidates, having been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 22-11-2019 which reads as under:

"Permission to file special leave petition is granted.

Based on the report of the Commission the impugned order is passed which cannot be said to be erroneous. We find from the report of the Commission that sufficient material is gathered through investigation in transparent manner. Illegalities committed go the root of the matter which vitiates the entire process of the selection. Hence, the special leave petitions are dismissed.

The selected candidates shall be permitted to appear in the examination afresh. The objection relating to the overage should not be raised. We make it clear that we have not commented anything with regard CBI investigation. We hope that the Manipur Public Service Commission will hold the main examination afresh as early as possible.

Pending application (S), if any, stands disposed of accordingly"

After the perusal of the above order, this Court is of the view that the Hon'ble Supreme Court cannot be said to have dismissed the SLPs in limine. It is something more than that, in the sense that the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the matter on merit and after having perused the report of the Committee, it dismissed the SLPs with appropriate reasons. Certain observations have also been given therein. In view of the law laid down in Khoday Distilleries Ltd. (supra), the above order is binding on all the parties. If the judgment and order is reviewed by this Court as contended by the counsels appearing for the review petitioners, the above order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court may be rendered redundant. After the SLPs being dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the successful

candidates had been removed from their respective posts by the State Government and the MPSC had issued a Notification dated 14-08-2020 for conducting a fresh Main Examination. If the review petitioners wished to file review petitions, they ought to have filed the same before the Hon'ble Supreme Court;

(b) The Committee consisting of two persons- one, a retired District & Sessions Judge and two, a retired IAS was constituted by this Court vide its order dated 20-11-2017 to which neither the State Government nor the successful candidates raised any objection. On the contrary, without doing any homework, some of the successful candidates approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of a petition for special leave to appeal being SLP (C) No. 37281-82 of 2017 questioning the validity and correctness of this Court's order dated 20-11-2017 wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed an order dated 11-01-2018 directing that the scope of enquiry would be confined to the answer sheets of the candidates who approached the High Court. Accordingly, this Court passed an order dated 19-01-2018 modifying its earlier order dated 20-11-2017. The Committee submitted its report dated 12-03-2018 confining to the answer sheets of the petitioners therein, a copy of which was forwarded to the Hon'ble Supreme Court pursuant to its direction/ order and after the perusal of the report, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 12-04-2018 permitted the Committee to look into all the

answer sheets of all the candidates. Thereafter, the Committee submitted its final report on 09-07-2017, in respect of the answer sheets of all candidates, with a large number of irregularities/ illegalities being committed by the MPSC. Since this Court's order dated 20-11-2017 was not quashed and set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it had been acted upon with the reports being submitted by the Committee. The purpose of filing the review petitions by the State Government and the successful candidates is nothing but to question indirectly this Court's order dated 20-11-2017 by which the Committee was constituted, which they could not do so directly. In other words, it is an indirect method adopted by the review petitioners which cannot be permitted by this Court;

(c) It may be noted that the Committee constituted by this Court is neither a statutory body nor a Commission appointed under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1952 nor an investigating agency like CBI or NIA or a CID/Crime Branch which is dutybound to collect materials, record statements of persons whose presence being relevant in respect of an incident/crime; analyse them; draw a conclusion/ finding and proceed in accordance with law for recommendation or trial in the court. This was not the job of the Committee which is simply a fact finding body, i.e., a Committee consisting of two private invividuals who agreed to do the job on the request of this

Court and it is not a public authority. Its job was to find out, if there was any irregularity/ error in the answer sheets of the candidates as alleged by the petitioners therein and submit a report thereof. In fact, it was the job which should have been done by this Court but as this Court was unable to do so for want of time, the Committee was constituted to do it on behalf of this Court and in other words, the Committee was constituted for a limited purpose as the agent/ representative of this Court;

(d) The principles of natural justice do apply only to the judicial or quasi-judicial or an administrative authority and while passing their order, they ought to follow the principles of natural justice. In other words, the principles of natural justice will apply only to the public authorities and not to the private individuals. As has been observed hereinabove, since the Committee constituted by this Court, was neither a judicial nor a quasi-judicial nor an administrative authority, it was not required for it to follow the principles of natural justice. In other words, its finding cannot be questioned on the ground that it had violated the principles of natural justice. It did its duty as directed by this Court on behalf of this Court and its duty was to find out if there was any error/ irregularity in the documents namely the answer sheets which were in the custody of the MPSC. It may further be noted that the documents namely the answer sheets with irregularities, speak for themselves and the Committee was not required to give any opportunity of being heard to the

candidates. The contention that the members of the Committee had violated the principles of natural justice is erroneous, misconceived and untenable. So far as this Court is concerned, the order dated 20-11-2017 was passed by this Court in the open Court and that too, in the presence of the counsels appearing for the parties. The validity and correctness of it was questioned by the successful candidates before the Hon'ble Supreme Court but it was not quashed and set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and on the contrary, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, after the perusal of the report in respect of the writ petitioners, granted permission to the Committee to inspect all the answer sheets including that of the successful candidates. Copies of the final report submitted by the Committee were furnished to the counsels appearing for the parties inviting their response thereto, if any. Neither the State Government nor the MPSC nor the successful candidates raised any objection to the report except one person confining to his case only. Thus, it is absolutely clear that this Court's order dated 20-11-2017 stood acted upon. The MPSC in its affidavit filed before this Court admitted the irregularities/ illegalities/ lapses found by the Committee and its only stand was that they could be attributed to the human errors. After having heard the learned counsels appearing for the parties for a long time, the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 was passed by this Court. Therefore, the question of violating the

principles of natural justice by this Court also did not arise at all, as enough opportunities as required in law, had been given to all the parties by this Court;

(e) The findings arrived at by the Committee were solely based on what were there in the answer sheets which were in the custody of the MPSC. No material was placed on record before this Court either by the State Government or by the successful candidates to show that the Committee had manipulated the answer sheets in order to favour someone or had given its findings contrary to what were there in the answer sheets. Therefore, the allegation that the members of the Committee were bias, is misconceived and baseless. In fact, this Court was not aware of the fact that the children of the members of the Committee had appeared and failed in the Preliminary Examination but it may be noted that they were appointed by this Court to represent and act on behalf of this Court and moreover, they were not entrusted the task of investigation; to examine witnesses and give their subjective opinion. They were entrusted the task of finding out the irregularities/ illegalities, if any, on the answer sheets which were in the custody of the MPSC and therefore, the question of malafide did not arise at all. Even if the task of verification or enquiry was entrusted to any other person or for that the State Government or the successful candidates, the findings as regards the irregularities, would remain the same except minor

human error here and there. This is quite evident from the interim report of the CBI submitted to this Court. After the SLPs being dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, a case under FIR No.RC-2(A)2020 dated 31-01-2020 was registered by the CBI and before the answer sheets numbering 4567 were seized by the CBI in accordance with law, a scrutiny/ verification as to the correctness of the findings of the Committee was done by the CBI with the help of Assistant professors of Manipur University, NIT and the Central Agriculture University on different dates. The CBI in its report dated 08-05-2020 observed that the same defects & irregularities as detected by the Enquuiry Committee were disclosed, when scrutiny was conducted by it with the help of the said Assistant Professors and accordingly, it had commenced its investigation in accordance with law, the relevant paragraph of which reads as under:

> ***"4. That, the scrutiny of the aforesaid Answer Scripts by the Assistant Professors of MU, NIT and CAU, Imphal before effective seizure, also disclosed the same defects & irregularities in the Answer Scripts as detected by the Enquiry Committee in their final report dtd. 09.07.2018 submitted before this Hon'ble Court"***

The role of this Court came to an end, when the judgment and order was passed by it and it is now for the CBI to investigate into the matter and if any person is found to be criminally liable, it may proceed in accordance with law. In the

event of any person being found to be not criminally liable but found to be grossly negligent/ deliberate dereliction in the discharge of his duty, a disciplinary proceeding may be initiated by the concerned authority against him. This Court does not express any opinion or observation in that regard and in particular, the investigation by the CBI;

[f] One of the contentions of the learned counsels appearing for the review petitioners is that the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 was passed by this Court based only on the findings of the Committee and since the members of the Committee had failed to reveal the fact that their children had appeared in the Preliminary Examination, the said judgment and order is liable to be reviewed by this Court. It has further been submitted by them that the members of the Committee were not fair and independent. Their contentions have no substance and merit at all. It may be noted that their children did fail in the Preliminary Examination, as a result of which they did not participate in the Main Examination. In their report, the Committee gave no recommendation which might influence the wisdom of this Court to pass an order in their favour or in favour of their children, rather the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 was aginst their interest for the reason that this Court had directed that it was open to the MPSC to conduct the Main Examination, 2016 afresh which means that no candidates including the children of the members who failed in the Preliminary

Examination, could appear in the Main Examination at all. The expression "**Main Examination 2016**" has been misinterpreted by the State Government in their rejoinder affidavit stating that the MPSC was not granted liberty by this Court to conduct examination from the stage of Main Examination, 2016. The State Government's attention is drawn to para 3.3 of the judgment and order dated 18-10-2019 wherein it has been observed by this Court that the Examination, 2016 was divided into stages-one, the Preliminary Examination, 2016 and two, the Main Examination, 2016. Therefore, this Court, while allowing the writ appeals as well as the writ petitions, made an observation, in its judgment and order dated 18-10-2019, with the expression "**it is open to the MPSC to conduct the Main Examinatiuon, 2016 afresh after due notice being given to the candidates**". There is no ambiguity at all in the said observation which has been made consciously by this Court because there was no any dispute as regards the result of the Preliminary Examination, 2016. The said observation requires no interpretation at all by anyone;

[g] The subject matter in issue before this Court was the validity and correctness of the recruitment process conducted by the MPSC and the State Government had no role to play in the recruitment process after the requisition being sent to the MPSC by it. In other words, the State Government is not an aggrieved person for filing the review petitions. The action of

the State Government appears to be unfair and unreasonable for the reason that the review petitions have been filed by it at the request of the successful candidates who failed to succeed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court as is apparently evident from the averments made by it in its review petitions. The review petitions appear to be frivolous one abusing the process of law which may invite exemplary costs. The State Government appears to have not been given proper legal advice before filing the review petitions. The State Government being an institution, ought to act fairly, reasonably and in public interest. The expression "**public interest**" does not mean the interest of the successful candidates only but it does definitely mean the interest of the public in general including that of the successful/ unsuccessful candidates and the unemployed youths. It ought to be neutral and cannot side with one of the parties, when the public money is involved. It does not and will not make any difference to the State Government, when "A" candidate or "B" candidate is selected and all that the State Government's concern is that good candidates are available with it to run the administration effectively and systematically. The first reaction of the State Government which ought to have been and is expected, is that the Main Examination, 2016 be conducted afresh in view of the irregularities/ illegalities/ lapses found on the part of the MPSC as mentioned by this Court in its judgment and order and by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. No

material has been brought to the notice of this Court that the State Government had ever written a letter to the MPSC expressing its anger and dissatisfaction in the manner in which the Examination, 2016 was conducted by the MPSC. Instead of doing that and despite the irregularities/ illegalities/ lapses being detected as aforesaid, the State Government appears to have been espousing, with vigour, the cause of the successful candidates only for the reasons best known to it. On top of that, no material has been placed on record by the successful candidates to show that since none of them is involved as claimed by them, in any manner, in the irregularities/ illegalities being committed by the MPSC, they have approached the appropriate forum with a suit claiming for damages/ compensation against the MPSC;

[h] As has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that the discovery of new and important matter or evidence can be one of the grounds for filing a review petition. Two points underlying it, are to be noted-one, mere discovery of new fact and important matter or evidence is not enough to be a ground because it is qualified by the expression "**which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within knowledge of the petitioner or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made"** with the result that new fact or evidence ought to be such which was not within the knowledge of the person concerned despite his due diligence. The

expression “**due diligence**” is very significant and important. In the present case, the Committee submitted its report on 09-07-2018 and even though the review petitioners knew very well that there were irregularties/ illegalites/ lapses on the part of the MPSC, there is no material on record to show that they made any sincere effort to know about the details of the Committee and in particular, the State Government which did nothing about it. The successful candidates applied for furnishing information under the RTI Act, 2005 only after they had lost their battle in the Hon’ble Supreme Court. They could have done that immediately after the report was submitted by the Committee. This fact clearly shows that the review petitioners were not diligent at all. Secondly, new fact and important matter or evidence ought to be such on the basis of which the earlier impugned order could be reviewed and in other words, the new fact or evidence ought to have shown that the materials on the basis of which the impugned order was passed, were incorrect warranting a review. It may be noted that in the present case, the judgment and order dated was passed by this Court on the basis of the commulative effect of the irregularities, illegalities and lapses on the part of the MPSC and not on the basis of the irregulaties found only in the report. It is a matter of fact that the answer sheets are full of irregularities which can never be removed therefrom by any means including the contention that the children of the members

of the Committee had appeared and failed in the Preliminary Examination and the irregularties will continue to remain in the answer sheets, as they are. Thus, it can be safely held that the findings of the report cannot be said to have caused any prejudice to the review petitioners;

[i] A large number of decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court are relied upon by counsels appearing for the review petitioners as shown in the preceding paragraph. These decisions can be broadly categorised into three groups as under:

(a) It is well settled principle of law that if any judgment or order is obtained by fraud, it cannot be said to be a judgment or order in law. A judgment, decree or order obtained by palying fraud on the court, tribunal or authority is a nullity and non est in the eye of the law.

(b) It is the duty of the investigating officer to conduct the investigation avoiding any kind of mischief and harassment to any of the accused.The investing officer should be fair and conscious so as to rule out any possibility of fabrication of evidence and his impartial conduct must dispel any suspicion as to its genuineness. A fair and proper investigation is always conducive to the ends of justice and for establishing the rule of law and maintaining proper balance in law and order.

(c) The Principles of natural justice ought to be followed by judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative authority while making any order affecting the right of a person and the non-obervance thereof is itself prejudice to him and proof

of prejudice independently of the proof of denial of natural justice is unnecessary.

There can be no and shall be no any dispute as regards the laws laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in their decisions as aforesaid and relied upon by the counsels appearing for the review petitioners. In terms of Article 141 of the Constitution of India, any law declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court shall be binding on all the Courts in the country including this Court. If there is one decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court laying down the law which is applicable to the facts of the case, that decision is more than enough and there is no need of citing many decisions amounting to unnesessary multiplication. Since the facts of the said cases are not identical with that of the present case, the decisions rendered therein will have no application at all to the facts of the present case.

[10] In view of the above and for the reasons stated hereinabove, the instant review petitions are devoid of merit and are accordingly dismissed with no order as to costs.

JUDGE **JUDGE**

FR/NFR

Devananda