Yumkham Rother
Digitally signed by Yumkham Rother
Date: 2020.09.08 12:05:35 +05'30'

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL

MC (Election Petition) No.24 of 2017
Ref: Election Petition No.8 of 2017

Shri Jyotin Waikhom, aged about 52 years,
s/o Waikhom Surendra Singh, resident of
ThangmeibandHijamLeikai, PO Lamphel,
Imphal West District, Maniur-795004.

....Applicant/Petitioner

-Versus-

Shri Khumukcham Joykishan Singh,
aged about 52 years, s/o late Kh.Ingocha Singh,
resident of ThangmeibandKhoyathongPolem
Leikai, PO Lamphel, Imphal West District,
Manipur and 1 Another.

....Respondents

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LANUSUNGKUM JAMIR

For the Applicant :: Ms.Ayangleima, Advocate

For the Respondents :: Mr.N.Ibotombi, Sr.Advocate

Dates of hearing :: 20, 21 and 24th August, 2020

Date of order ::

O R D E R (CAV)

The present application has been filed under Order VIII Rule IX of the Civil Procedure Code, by the applicant/Election Petitioner praying for allowing to file subsequent pleading to the written statement filed by the respondent No.1.

[2] At the outset, it is put on record that learned counsel for the applicant/Election Petitioner submits that she is not pressing Para 3 B (ii) of the application.

[3] Before adverting to the facts in hand, it is brought on record that the MC (El.Pet) No.24 of 2017 was filed on 10.10.2017 stating that after the respondent No.1 had filed the written statement, the applicant has found certain facts which was not known by the applicant as such, it is necessary to file the subsequent pleading to the written statement of the respondent No.1 filed on 11.09.2017. Thereafter, the applicant again filed MC (Elec Pet) No.24 of 2019 under Order VI Rule 17 read with Section 151 of the Civil Procedure Code, praying for amendment of the MC (Elect Pet) No.24 of 2017.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court by order dated 5.8.2020 had allowed the applicant to amend the MC (Elec Pet) No.24 of 2017 strictly as proposed at Para 6 of MC (Elec Pet) No.24 of 2019. Accordingly, recast petition of MC (Elect Pet) No.24 of 2017 was filed on 7.8.2020.

[4] It is the case of the applicant that after perusal of the written statement of respondent No.1 he has found certain facts which were not known to him and, therefore it has become highly necessaryto file the subsequent pleading to the written statement of the respondent No.1. The subsequent pleadings sought to be made by the applicant are as under:

> "*3.A.(i) That, the Respondent No.1 had never submitted the Nomination paper dated 13.02.2017 along with Affidavit sworn on 13.02.2017 before the Returning Officer, 9-Thangmeiband Assembly Constituency as the said Nomination Paper and the Affidavit dated 13.02.2017 were not affixed in a conspicuous place at the Office of the Returning Officer for the information of the electors relating to the Constituency as per Section 33A Clause 3 of the Representative of the People Act, 1951 and also as per the instruction of the ECI dated 15.06.2009. This facts are new to the Applicant which are required to be specifically replied by the Petitioner by filing a Rejoinder/Replication.*
>
> *3.A(ii) That, the Applicant begs to submit that the said Affidavit dated 13.02.2017 of the Respondent No.1 was not uploaded in the Official Website www.ceomanipur.nic.in However, in accordance with the relevant provision of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Nomination Paper along with the Affidavit dated 10.02.2017 of the Respondent No.1 was affixed in a conspicuous place at the Office of the Returning Officer for the information of the Electors. Such affidavit dated 10.02.2017 was accepted on 16.02.2017 by the Returning Officer after scrutiny and thereafter the same was uploaded in the Official Website www.ceomanipur.nic.in after the contesting candidates are finalized. These facts are also required to bring on records by filing a replication.*

3A(iii) That, on going through the Written Statement filed by the Respondent No.1, it is found that there were certain facts and pleas/allegations made by the Respondent No.1 which are required to be specifically replied by the Petitioner by filing a Rejoinder/Replication.

3A(iv) That, the Respondent No.1 is still concealing correct material fact regarding immovable property own by him in Para 7(A) column (B) of the Form No.26 regarding the property which is under Dag No.7148/7419 is/are self acquired property. Indeed as per the official records the said property was brought/purchased by the respondent No.1 from SmtTayenjam (N) Bilashini Devi by executing a registered Sale Deed dated 26.03.2013 being registration No.1062(V) of the Office of the Sub-Registrar (HQ) Imphal, Manipur. Therefore, such statement/declaration made in the Affidavit dated 13.02.2017 of the Respondent No.1 relating that the said immovable property is inherited one is false declaration/statement. Such factum of false statement/false declaration is not only made before the Officer concerned of the ECI and more particularly the Returning Officer concerned but also such false statement is made before the authority of this Hon'ble High Court.

Further, it is to submit that the Respondent No.1 while submitting the relevant affidavit before the Returning Officer, did not disclosed the Non-Agricultural lands which is recorded in his name in the relevant land records as owner and physical possessor in respect of i) Dag No.1087, ii) Dag No.1026, iii) Dag No.1031, iv) Dag No.1028, v) Dag No.1030, vi) Dag No.1156, vii) Dag No.1027, viii) Dag No.1155 and ix) Dag No.1154 which are situated at Village No.100, AkpalKhulun, Sub Division:- Lamshang, SekmaiTahsil of Imphal West District, Manipur. And that in the aforesaid Affidavit dated 10.02.2017 or affidavit 13.02.2017 the Respondent No.1 intentionally and knowingly filled up on the relevant format as 'NIL' in Part A-B (ii) of the said affidavit. As such, the action and

decision of the respondent No.1 while submitting the relevant affidavit before the Returning Officer concerned has caused materially effected in the election process/proceeding in the present election. Therefore, the authority of the concerned/Returning Officer of the 9-Thangmeiband Constituency should have declared the Respondent No.1 as returned candidate as null and void.

Further, it is worth to mention that in the affidavit dated 10.02.2017 or the affidavit dated 13.02.2017 at B (iv) of Part A of the Respondent No.1 the submission or the statement of the homestead land under Dag No.7418/7419 as an inherited property as well as non mentioning of proper or detailed statements of non agricultural land in the affidavit is/was not only a false declaration but also non disclosure of such property in the relevant prescribed form.

An attested true and correct copy of the certified copy of the Sale Deed dated 26.03.2013 is annexed hereto marked as Annexure-M/1 as a part of the Subsequent Pleading.

An attested true and correct copy of the certified copy of the Jamabandi copy of C.S Dag No.7498/7419 along with English translation is annexed hereto marked as Annexure-M/2 as a part of the Subsequent Pleading.

An attested true and correct copy of the certified jamabandi copy of C.S Dag No.1087 recorded in the name of respondent No.1 along with English translation is annexed hereto and marked as Annexure-M/3 as a part of the subsequent pleading.

An attested true and correct copy of the certified jamabandi copies of C.S Dag No.1026, 1031, 1028, 1030, 1156, 1027, 1155, 1154 along with English Translation along with English translation are annexed hereto and marked as Annexure-M/4 (Colly) as a part of the subsequent pleading.

3B(i) In para no.5 of the Written Statement, the answering deponent/petitioner denies the whole statements made therein and beg to submit that the Respondent No.1 has full knowledge regarding the land under Dag No.8026 which is recorded in the name of Verona Khumukcham and has concealed the relevant fact by producing Jamabandi dated 31.02.2011 which is not a latest one (Annexure J/5 in the written statement), Moreover, the land under Dag No.8026 had been sold by the respondent No.1 to PukhramNaoba Singh by executing a sale deed dated 16.01.2012 being Regd No.93(V) of the Sub Registrar (HQ), Imphal Manipur and the said land had been mutated in the name of PukhramNaoba Singh by cancelling the name of the Respondent No.1 vide Mutation Case No.39/AS and SO-IW-II of 2012 on the basis of the said Sale Deed instrument. And again the homestead land has been mutated and entered in the name of Verona Khumukcham by cancelling the name of PukhramNaoba Singh vide Mutation case Naoba Singh and Verona Khumukcham being registration No.940 (V) dated 18.03.2013. As such, regarding the declaration made in both the affidavits in respect of the immovable properties mentioned in column Part A-B are one and the same and there is no change of such properties in both the affidavits. In other words, the declaration made by the respondent No.1, in the affidavits, dated 10.02.2017 and 13.02.2017 in respect of the immovable properties are false declaration and intentionally made knowing it to be false. In any case, in consideration of either the affidavit dated

10.02.2017 or 13.02.2017 of the respondent No.1, it can be construed that respondent No.1 concealed the material fact as to the mode of acquiring the right of the non agricultural land and is still sticking to his false contention in both the affidavit and as such, the relevant provision of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 has been violated by the respondent No.1 while submitting the relevant affidavit and the same has been improperly accepted by the concerned Returning Officer.

The Statement made in the last sub para of Para No.5 in the written statement of the Respondent No.1 is the subsequent development of fact which is not at all relevant at the present petition.

An attested true correct copy of the certified copy of the Sale Deed dated 16.01.2012 is annexed hereto and marked as Annexure M/5 as a part of the subsequent pleading.

An attested true and correct copy of the certified copy of the Sale Deed dated 18.03.2013 is annexed hereto marked as Annexure-M/6 as a part of the subsequent pleading.

An attested true copy of the Jamabandi of C.S Dag No.1026 recorded in the name of Verona Khumukcham along with English translation is annexed hereto and marked as Annexure-M/7 as a part of Subsequent pleading.

3B (ii) In para No.10 & 11 of the Written statement of the Respondent No.1, the Applicant/petitioner beg to submit that both the affidavits of the Respondent No.1 has failed to furnish the correct and true statements in connection with the immovable properties and

more particularly failed to disclose the existence of FIR registered against the Respondent No.1 which ought to have been disclosed in his affidavit. There are two FIRs being a) FIR No.(7)(1)1996 IPS u/s 10/13 UA (P) Act, and b) FIR No.233 (4) 96 IPS u/s 10/13 UA (P) Act against the respondent No.1 and in the Affidavit at Column No.(5)(i)(ii) Part A of Form 26 of the Format under the relevant Provision of RP Act, 1951 and other laws which is in force in the country, relating to non disclosure of information/declaration in the affidavit as per the R.P.Act, 1951, it comes to the conclusion that the nomination paper(s) so submitted by the Respondent No.1 has concealed and suppressed material facts. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances as stated above, such false affidavit/false declaration submitted by the Respondent No.1 in his nomination paper and affidavit and in that eventuality acceptance of such affidavit of the same by Returning Officer despite the objection of the petitioner or his agent, the respondent No.1 is/was not entitled even to contest the election.

And that from the perusal of the written statement of respondent No.1, he is still concealing the material facts and substantial characters in the affidavit as such in order to adjudicate/find out such concealment the present petitioner prays that the relevant FIRs may be enclosed as a part of document in the list of documents to be supplied by petitioner later on."

[5] Heard Ms.Ayangleima, learned counsel for the applicant as well as Mr.N.Ibotombi, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent.

[6] Ms.Ayangleima, learned counsel for the applicant submits that no new pleading is intended to be pleaded by the applicant in the subsequent pleading to the written statement of the respondent No.1. However, the applicant intends only to

make clarification on the new facts and wrong statements made by the respondent No.1 and which were not within the knowledge of the applicant while filing the Election Petition.

It is submitted that the applicant as Election Petitioner, in his Election Petition has taken the ground that the respondent No.1 has failed to disclose full particulars of his assets and immovable properties in his affidavit dated 10.02.2017,the respondent No.1 failed to disclose vital material information in his affidavit pertaining to his non agricultural lands, the respondent No.1 failed to disclose the total value of both movable and immovable assets under Part-B(1) 8 A and B of the affidavit. The relevant columns of the affidavit were left blank with regard to such particulars. Further, the particulars with regard to spouse and dependant No.1 was also indicated as 'NIL', which were false as there are movable properties in their possession in the form of cash in hand, bank deposits, gold ornaments, LIC policies etc along with other grounds. However, after the written statement was filed by the respondent No.1, the applicant detected that the respondent No.1 has made false statements, particularly with regard to the affidavit dated 13.02.2017 alleged to have been submitted along with the nomination paper. The respondent No.1 has also given wrong statement with regard to the movable properties, non agricultural lands as well as immovable and movable assets. Learned counsel, therefore submits that if the same are not clarified it would cause prejudice to the applicant/Election Petitioner. It is further submitted that if the applicant is allowed to file replication in the Election Petition no prejudice would be caused to the

respondent No.1. The replication sought to be filed is only by way of clarification clarifying the wrong/false statements made by the respondent No.1 in his written statement. In her support, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance in the case of (1)**Kalyan Mal Mina Vs Ratan Lal Tambi** reported in **AIR 1981 Raj 249**, (2) **Sunil Vasanth Architects & Consulting Engineers Vs Tata Ceramics Ltd**reported in **AIR 1999 Ker 88**, (3) **Gurjant Singh Vs Krishan Chander&Ors** reported in **AIR 2001 Raj 211**, (4) **Mohar Singh Vs Laxmi Chand** reported in **AIR 2006 Ald 168**, (5) Decision dated 29.04.2009 of the Allahabad High Court in the case of **SheoDeen Mishra Vs Ajit Kumar Jain**(6) **Ramesh Kumar Vs Chandu Lal** reported in **AIR 2009 Raj 87**, (7) **MalgireddyVenkataRamana Vs ThippanaNarsi Reddy** reported in **AIR 2010 AP 114**, (8) **Rupadhar Pujari Vs GangadharBhatra** reported in **(2004) 7 SCC 654, (9) Judgment and order dated 16.10.2018 of the Manipur High Court** in the Case of **YumkhamErabot Singh Vs Okram Henry Singh &Anr** and (10) **Judgment and order dated 14.01.2019 of the Manipur High Court** in the case of **Md Amin Shah Vs Nahakpam Indrajit Singh &Ors.**

[7] Mr.N.Ibotombi, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent on the other hand submits that as regards the affidavit dated 13.02.2017 filed along with the nomination paper as indicated in the written statement of the respondent, the same can be decided by this Court after framing of issues. He submits that all facts should be stated in the Election Petition and no new facts can be permitted to be inserted in the replication. He has drawn the attention of this Court to

Section 81 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (RP Act hereinafter) which provides that Election Petition should be presented within 45 (forty five) days from the date of the election of the Returned Candidate. The replication sought to be made by the applicant clearly violates the requirement of Section 81 of the RP Act inasmuch as such replication having new facts is sought to be introduced after the expiry of 45 (forty five) days.

Learned senior counsel submits that in the Election Petition filed by the applicant as Election Petitioner specific facts should be disclosed in order to permit the respondent to rebut such allegations. In the present case in hand, it is submitted that the applicant as Election Petitioner has failed to give the details of such material facts in his Election Petition.

Learned senior counsel also places reliance on Section 83 of the RP Act which provides that any Election Petition should contain the concise statement of material facts on which the petitioner relies. He submits that in the present case the applicant/Election Petitioner has failed to disclose the material facts upon which the applicant/Election Petitioner places reliance. In the absence of any concise statement of material facts the present application is nothing else but an attempt to amend the Election Petition by way of filing replication. Such action on the part of the applicant/Election Petitioner should not be allowed and is also not permissible in law inasmuch as the applicant/Election Petitioner is debarred from bringing in new facts by way of filing replication. He, therefore, places reliance in the case of (1) **Dharlipakar Vs**

Rajiv Gandhi reported in **AIR 1987 SC 1577** (2) **Jitu Patnaik Vs SanatanMohakud** reported in **2012 (4) SCC 194** (3) **JeetMohinder Singh Vs Harminder** reported in **1999 (9) SCC 386** (4) **ThangjamMohendro Singh Vs Th.Lokeshwar Singh** reported in **2019 (4) NEJ 689 (Man)**.

[8] This Court has considered the submissions forwarded by the learned counsels appearing for the parties.

[9] The grounds on which the applicant seeks to file replication is that no new facts are being inserted, however, the replication is sought only by way of making clarification to the new pleading as well as wrong statements made by the respondent No.1 in his written statement dated 11.09.2017. The replication sought to be made by the applicant has already been reproduced hereinabove.

[10] It is to be borne in mind that the applicant/Election Petitioner had filed his Election Petition under Section 80 A/81 of the RP Act challenging the election of the respondent No.1 to the 11th Manipur Legislative Assembly from the 9-Thangmeiband Assembly Constituency on 24.11.2017.

[11] The respondent No.1 filed his written statement on 11.09.2017 therein rebutting the allegation made by the Election Petitioner. The respondent No.1 has replied in detail clarifying the affidavit dated 10.02.2017 and also the affidavit dated 13.02.2017 submitted along with the nomination paper. The respondent No.1 has also given a detailed statement with regard to his non agricultural lands and assets and liabilities. It

is only after filing of the written statement that the applicant/Election Petitioner has filed the present application for filing subsequent pleadings to the written statement dated 11.09.2017 filed by the respondent No.1. The clarification that are sought to be made by the applicant/Election Petitioner as well as the pleadings made in the Election petition has been considered by this Court.

[12] In the case of **Dharlipakar Vs Rajiv Gandhi** (supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

> "*14. Before we consider various paragraphs of the election petition to determine the correctness of the High Court order we think it necessary to bear in mind the nature of the right to elect, the right to be elected and the right to dispute election and the trial of the election petition. Right to contest election or to question the election by means of an election petition is neither common law nor fundamental right instead it is a statutory right regulated by the statutory provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 195 1. There is no fundamental or common law right in these matters. This is well-settled by catena of decisions of this Court in N.P. Ponnuswami v. Returning Officer, [1952] 1 SCR 2 18; JaganNath v. Jaswant Singh, AIR 1954 SC 210 and JoytiBasu v. Debi Ghosal, [1982] 3 SCR 318. These decisions have settled the legal position that outside the statutory provisions there is no right to dispute an election.* ***The Representation of the People Act is a complete and self contained code within which any rights claimed in relation to an election or an election dispute must be found. The provi- sions of the Civil Procedure Code are applicable to the extent as permissible by Section 87 of the Act.*** *The scheme of the Act as noticed earlier would show that an election can be questioned under the statute as provided by Section 80 on the grounds as contained in Section 100 of the Act.* ***Section 83 lays down a mandatory provision in providing that an election petition shall contain a concise statement of material facts and set forth full particulars of***

corrupt practice. The pleadings are regulated by Section 83 and it makes it obligatory on the election petitioner to give the requisite facts, details and particulars of each corrupt practice with exactitude. If the election petition fails to make out a ground under Section 100 of the Act it must fail at the threshold. Allegations of corrupt practice are in the nature of criminal charges, it is necessary that there should be no vagueness in the allegations so that the re- turned candidate may know the case he has to meet. If the allegations are vague and general and the particulars of corrupt practice are not stated in the pleadings, the trial of the election petition cannot proceed for want of cause of action. The emphasis of law is to avoid a fishing and roving inquiry*. It is therefore necessary for the Court to scrutinize the pleadings relating to corrupt practice in a strict manner."*

(*emphasis supplied)*

[13] In the case of **Jitu Patnaik Vs SanatanMohakud** (supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court has also held as under:

"*43. Order VI Rule 2 of CPC, to the extent it is relevant, reads as under:*

2. Pleading to state material facts and not evidence.--(1) Every pleading shall contain, and contain only, a statement in a concise form of the material facts on which the party pleading relies for his claim or defence as the case may be, but not the evidence by which they are to be proved.

(2) xxx xxx xxx

(3) xxx xxx xxx"

44. Section 83(1)(a) of the 1951 Act is as follows :
"S. 83. Contents of petition.--(1) An election petition--
(a) shall contain a concise statement of the material facts on which the petitioner relies;"

45. A bare perusal of the above provisions would show that the first part of Order VI Rule 2, CPC is similar to clause 1(a) of Section 83 of the 1951 Act. ***It is imperative for an election petition to contain a concise statement of the material facts on which the election petitioner relies. What are material facts? All basic and primary facts which must be proved at the trial by a party to establish the existence of cause of action or defence are material facts. The bare allegations are never treated as material facts. The material facts are such facts which afford a basis for the allegations made in the election petition. The meaning of 'material facts' has been explained by this Court on more than one occasion.*** *Without multiplying the authorities, reference to one of the later decisions of this Court in VirenderNathGautam v. Satpal Singh and others (2007) 3 SCC 617 shall suffice.*

46. In VirenderNathGautam (2007) 3 SCC 617, this Court referred to the leading case of Philipps v. Philipps and Others (1878) 4 QBD 127 (CA) and the subsequent decision in Bruce v. Odhams Press Limited (1936) 1 KB 697 that referred to Philipps (1878) 4 QBD 127 (CA) and observed in paragraphs 34 and 35 (Pg. 629) of the Report as follows: (VirenderNath case (2007) 3 SCC 617, SCC p.629)

> *"34.* ***A distinction between "material facts" and "particulars", however, must not be overlooked. "Material facts" are primary or basic facts which must be pleaded by the plaintiff or by the defendant in support of the case set up by him either to prove his cause of action or defence. "Particulars", on the other hand, are details in support of material facts pleaded by the party. They amplify, refine and embellish material facts*** *by giving distinctive touch to the basic contours of a picture already drawn so as to make it full, more clear and more informative.* ***"Particulars" thus ensure conduct of fair trial and would not take the opposite party by surprise****.*
>
> *35.* ***All "material facts" must be pleaded by the party in support of the case set up by him. Since the object and purpose is to enable the opposite party to know the case***

> ***<u>he has to meet with, in the absence of pleading, a party cannot be allowed to lead evidence. Failure to state even a single material fact, hence, will entail dismissal of the suit or petition. Particulars, on the other hand, are the details of the case which is in the nature of evidence a party would be leading at the time of trial</u>***."
>
> *(emphasis supplied)*

[14] Further in the case of **Jeet Mohinder Singh** (supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

> "*40. Before we may proceed to deal, in exercise of our appellate jurisdiction, with the pleas raised on behalf of the petitioner-appellant canvassing commission of corrupt practices by the respondent which in the opinion of the High Court the election petitioner has failed in proving, we would like to state a few well-settled legal principles in the field of election jurisprudence and relevant to our purpose. They are :*
>
> *(i) . ...*
>
> *(ii) . ...*
>
> *(iii) . ...*
>
> *(iv)* ***<u>Section 83 of the Act requires every election petition to contain a concise statement of the material facts on which the appellant relies. If the election petition alleges commission of corrupt practice at the election, the election petition shall set forth full particulars of any corrupt practice including as full a statement as possible of the names of the parties alleged to have committed such corrupt practice and the date and place of the commission of each such practice</u>***. *Every*

> *election petition must be signed and verified by the appellant in the manner laid down for the verification of pleadings in the CPC. An election petition alleging corrupt practice is required to be accompanied by an affidavit in Form 25 read with Rule 94A of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961. Form 25 contemplates the various particulars as to the corrupt practices mentioned in the election petition being verified by the appellant separately under two headings: (i) which of such statements including particulars are true to appellant's own knowledge, and (ii) which of the statements including the particulars are true to information of the appellant. It has been held in GajananKrishnajiBapat's case (supra) that the election petitioner is also obliged to disclose his source of information in respect of the commission of the corrupt practice so as to bind him to the charge levelled by him and to prevent any fishing or roving enquiry, also be prevent the returned candidate from being taken by surprise*."
>
> *(emphasis supplied)*

[15] The pleadings made in the Election Petition with regards to the allegations made against the respondent does not disclose any facts, details and particular of the corrupt practice in detail. The allegations are vague thereby keeping the respondent in the dark about the case that he has to meet. No particulars are given in the Election Petition describing the allegations levelled against the respondent except in paragraph 15 about the ownership of the respondent No.1 with regard to a patta land.

[16] On consideration of the pleadings in the replication sought to be made, it becomes amply clear that the applicant/Election Petitioner is trying to bring in new facts thereby indirectly amending his Election Petition

which have not been stated in the Election Petition. The replication intended to be filed by the applicant/Election Petitioner is nothing but a bundle of new facts. Such facts should have been averred in the Election Petition by the applicant/Election Petitioner and not in the replication. By allowing the applicant/Election Petitioner to file his replication will amount to amending his pleadings/improving his pleading, which would prejudice the case of the respondent No.1. The plea taken by the applicant for filing subsequent pleadings/replication are new pleas which cannot be permitted, particularly in an Election Petition and that too after expiry of 45 (forty five) days. This, in the considered opinion of this Court would be violative of Section 81 of the RP Act, inasmuch as it is barred by time.

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, there is no merit in the present Misc. Application and is, accordingly dismissed.

List the main Election Petition on 7th September, 2020 for framing of issues.

JUDGE

Priyojit

MAYANG LAMBAM CHANU NANDINI

Digitally signed by MAYANGLAMBAM CHANU NANDINI
Date: 2020.09.01 11:47:07 +05'30'