

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**CWP No.1299 of 2026**  
**Date of Decision: 05.10.2026**

---

**Tek Ram**

**.....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Union of India & Anr.**

**.....Respondents**

---

**Coram**

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.**

**Whether approved for reporting? Yes.**

**For the Petitioner:** Mr. Maan Singh, Advocate.

**For the respondent:** Mr. Nand Lal Thakur, Senior Panel Counsel,  
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar,  
Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi  
Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy  
Advocates General, for respondent No.2-  
State.

---

**Sandeep Sharma, J.** (Oral)

The question, which needs to be determined in the case at hand, is “whether the petitioner is entitled to interest on solatium or not?”

**2.** Aforesaid issue is no more *res integra*, rather stands decided by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in case titled ***Union of India versus Tek Ram and Ors***, Civil Revision No. 164 of 2022, decided on 16.12.2025 (Annexure A-4). While placing reliance upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Sunder Singh versus Union of India*, (2001) 7 SCC 211, Coordinate Bench of this Court held that interest on solatium is payable.

**3.** Though an attempt has been made by Mr. Nand Lal Thakur, learned Senior Panel Counsel, to defeat the claim of the petitioner on the ground that RFA filed by the Union of India i.e. RFA No. 310 of 2007, titled *Union of India versus Jagat Ram and others*, was decided by placing reliance upon the judgment rendered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in RFA No. 310 of 2007, titled *Union of India versus Jagat Ram and another*, but since the aforesaid judgment has been stayed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the SLP filed by the Union of India, prayer made on behalf of the petitioner in the case at hand cannot be accepted, however, this Court is not persuaded to agree with Mr. Nand Lal Thakur, learned Senior Panel Counsel, for the reason that in the instant case, issue is only with regard to interest, if any, payable on the solatium, coupled with the fact that judgment dated 06.11.2015 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in RFA No. 310 of 2007, titled *Union of India versus Jagat Ram*, was never challenged before the Hon'ble Apex Court, rather Union of India filed an SLP against judgment dated 06.08.2025 passed in Review Petition No. 60 of 2025, titled *Union of India versus Jagat Ram and Anr*, whereby the Union of India had sought review of judgment dated 06.11.2015 passed by this Court in RFA No. 310 of 2007.

**4.** Since judgment dated 06.08.2025 passed in Review Petition No. 60 of 2025 has been stayed by the Hon'ble Apex Court and not judgment dated 06.11.2015 passed by this Court in RFA No.

310 of 2007, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive, rather deems it fit to dispose of the same with a direction to the respondents to deposit the enhanced amount of compensation after granting interest on the amount of solatium strictly in terms of the judgment passed by this Court in Civil Revision No. 164 of 2022, titled *Union of India versus Tek Ram and Ors.*, wherein afore Court, having placed reliance upon the judgment rendered in *Sunder Singh* (supra), proceeded to hold that interest on solatium is payable.

**5.** Consequently, in view of the above, present petition is allowed and respondents are directed to deposit the enhanced amount of compensation after granting interest on the amount of solatium strictly in terms of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Sunder Singh* (supra) within a period of six weeks and deposit the same with the Registry of this Court within a period of eight weeks thereafter.

**6.** In the aforesaid terms, present petition is disposed of along with pending applications, if any.

**October 05, 2026**  
(sunil)

**(Sandeep Sharma),**  
**Judge**