

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

CWP No. 10875 of 2026.

Decided on : 8th July, 2026.

Sheesh Ram

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.

*Whether approved for reporting?*¹

For the Petitioner:

Mr. Amir Khan, Advocate.

For the respondents:

Mr. Pushpender Jaswal, Additional Advocate
General.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral).

Notice. Mr. Pushpender Jaswal, learned Additional Advocate General appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. By way of this writ petition, the petitioner has inter alia prayed for following relief:

"i) That the respondents may kindly be directed to re-employee, re-enrol and re-enlist the petitioner as Hom Guard in accordance with the directions issued by this Hon'ble Court in CWP No.3628 of 2020, titled as Inder Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Others decided on 05.01.2021 and other matters decided vide Annexure P-1 (Colly) and extend the same benefit, to the petitioner in view of the above referred judgments, which have been implemented by the respondents."

3. A perusal of the affidavit filed along with the present petition demonstrates that the petitioner as of now is 55 years of age. He is praying for issuance of directions to re-employee, re-enroll and re-enlist

¹ Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

him as a Home Guard. The petitioner is relying upon a judgment dated 05.01.2020 passed by this Court in CWP No.3628 of 2020, titled as Inder Singh vs. State of H.P. & Ors., A perusal of the said judgment, copy whereof is appended with the present petition, demonstrates that persons aspiring to be enlisted as Home Guard should not have crossed the prescribed age of 50 years. Besides other conditions which such a candidate has to fulfill, it has also to be ensured that such a candidate should not be less than 18 years of age and not more than 50 years of age where he is seeking re-enrollment or re-enlistment.

4. In the present case, as admittedly, the petitioner is now more than 55 years of age, meaning thereby, he has crossed the maximum age limit of 50 years, no relief, as prayed for, can be granted in favour his favour.

5. Though, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has earlier also approached to the Authorities etc., but then this cannot come to the rescue of the petitioner. This is for the reason that in terms of the averments made in the writ petition, the petitioner was appointed as a Home Guard in the year 1991 and he served as such only till the year 1995. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner also submitted that the petitioner had earlier also approached this Court by way of CWP No. 2440 of 2011, in which, as per him, directions were passed

...3...

for consideration, however, this also, in the considered view of this Court cannot come to the rescue of the petitioner because nothing prevented him from approaching this Court or the Authorities seeking the relief, which is now being prayed by him, before he had crossed the age limit of 50 years. It is not his case that it is only recently that the upper age limit of 50 years has been fixed by the department for the purpose of re-enrollment. These conditions were there even in the year 2021 when the judgment was passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in Inder Singh 's case (supra) i.e. the judgment which is being relied upon by the petitioner.

6. In light of the above discussion, reliefs as prayed for by the petitioner cannot be granted. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

8th July, 2026.
(jai)