

Ramesh Kumar v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

CMP-T No. 354 of 2026

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Rajat Kumar, Advocate, for the applicant.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Reply/instructions, as prayed for, be filed within two weeks. List on 24.9.2026.

September 10, 2026

manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Roop Chand v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

CMP-T No. 335 of 2026 in Execution Petition No. 12 of 2025

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Virender Singh Rathore, Advocate, for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Mr. Tara Chand Chauhan, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Though reply to the petition is stated to have been filed by respondents No. 1 to 3, but same is not on record.

Registry to trace and place the same on record, if in order.

List after two weeks. In the meantime, learned counsel for respondent No.4 may also file reply.

September 10, 2026

manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Manju Bala v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Anr.

RP No. 31 of 2026

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Onkar Jairath, Senior Advocate with Mr. Piyush Mehta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

As prayed, list on 21.9.2026.

September 10, 2026

manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Pratam Singh Verma v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Anr.

Execution Petition No. 14 of 2026

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. J.S. Bhogal, Senior Advocate with Ms. Swati Verma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Further one week's time, as prayed for, is granted to the learned Additional Advocate General to have instructions with regard to deposit of the award amount, if any, made pursuant to directions issued by this Court in CARBC No. 26 of 2026. List on **22.9.2026**.

September 10, 2026
manjit

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

Baldev Singh v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

CMP No. 20129 of 2025 in Execution Petition No.109 of 2025

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Naresh Verma, Advocate, for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Learned counsel representing the applicant/petitioner fairly states that with the efflux of time, present application has been rendered infructuous and same be disposed of accordingly, reserving liberty to the applicant/petitioner to file appropriate proceedings before appropriate court of law for surviving grievances, if any. Ordered accordingly. The application is disposed of.

September 10, 2026
manjit

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

CHANDER SHEKHAR Versus STATE OF HP AND ORS along with connected
matter

Execution Petition No. 14 of 2021 a/w Arb. Case No. 301 of 2024

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Rakesh Manta, Advocate, for the petitioners in
Execution Petition No. 14 of 2021 and for the
respondents in Arb. Case No. 301 of 2024.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional
Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr.
Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the
State in Execution Petition No. 14 of 2021 and for
the petitioners in Arb. Case No. 301 of 2024.

Execution Petition No. 14 of 2021

Vide separate order of even date, matter stands
disposed of.

Arb. Case No. 301 of 2024

De-link from Execution Petition No. 14 of 2021.

**OMP No. 1045 of 2024 in Arb. Case No. 301 of
2024**

Though reply to the application is stated to have
been filed, but same is not on record. Registry to trace and
place the same on record, if in order.

List on 18.9.2026.

September 10, 2026
manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Gram Panchayat at Jhiri and Ors. v. Union of India and Ors.

CWP No. 2178 of 2026

09.09.2026 Present: Ms. Ranjana Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Balram Sharma, Deputy Solicitor General of India with Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

Ms. Shreya Chauhan, Advocate, for respondents No. 2 to 5.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for respondents No. 6 to 8.

As prayed, list on 10.9.2026.

September 09, 2026

manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Smt. Rama Devi v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

CWP No. 15680 of 2026

09.09.2026 Present: Mr.Gaurav Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

As prayed, list on 10.9.2026.

September 09, 2026

manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Tedavi Life Sciences v. Union of India and Ors.

CWP No. 15679 of 2026

09.09.2026 Present: Mr. Anuj Nag, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Balram Sharma, Deputy Solicitor General of India with Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondents No. 1 & 2.
Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for respondents No. 3 & 4.

Notice. Mr. Balram Sharma, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India and Mr. Rajat Chaudhary, learned Assistant Advocate General, appear and waive service of notice on behalf of respondents No.1 & 2 and respondents No.3 &4, respectively. Reply be filed within three weeks. List thereafter.

CMP No. 23338 of 2026

Disposed of as not pressed at this stage.

September 09, 2026
manjit

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

Guru Ravi Dass Mandir and Anr. v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

CWP No. 2184 of 2026

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Senior Advocate with Mr. Atharv Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

CWP No. 2184 of 2026 & CMP No. 2984 of 2026

Notice. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, waives notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4. He prays for and is granted four weeks' time to file reply.

Issue separate notices to respondents No. 5 to 9, returnable for **12.10.2026**, on taking steps within two days.

In the meantime, operation and execution of order dated 23.12.2025, passed by the learned Divisional Commissioner, Kangra at Dharamshala (Annexure P-8), is stayed.

September 10, 2026
manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Kashmir Singh v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

Ex.Petition No. 1560 of 2026

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Mehar Chand Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Mr. Tara Chand Chauhan, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

While placing on record communication dated 22.08.2026 issued under signatures of Deputy Commissioner, Kangra at Dharamshala, learned Deputy Advocate General states that mandate contained in the judgment sought to be executed stands complied with.

Having perused the office order dated 27.07.2026 annexed with aforesaid communication, this Court finds merit in the contention of learned Deputy Advocate General and as such, nothing remains to be adjudicated in the instant proceedings and accordingly, same are closed, reserving liberty to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings before appropriate court of law, laying therein challenge to the order passed in purported compliance of judgment sought to be executed.

September 10, 2026
manjit

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

Gram Panchayat at Jhiri and Ors. v Union of India and Ors.

CWP No. 2178 of 2026

10.09.2026 Present: Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Balram Sharma, Deputy Solicitor General of India with Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.1.
Ms. Shreya Chauhan, Advocate, for respondents No. 2 to 5.
Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for respondents No. 6 to 8.

By way of instant application, prayer has been made on behalf of the applicant/respondent No. 2 to issue directions to the district administration to ensure that work of construction of National Highway NH-03 (Takoli to Kullu section at Jheeri Chowk) is not hampered by the residents of the area, who are raising objection with regard to construction of flyover.

2. While seeking time to file reply to the application, Mr. Ravi Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General, representing the respondents-State, fairly states that it is the duty of the district administration to maintain law and order and to provide police protection. He states that as and when request is made by the National Highways Authority to provide police protection, the same shall be provided forthwith.

3. Though averments contained in the application, which is duly supported by affidavit, reveal that applicant/respondent No. 2 has already approached the police authorities for providing protection, but yet learned counsel for the applicant states that fresh application shall be filed to the Superintendent of Police of the district concerned within a

period of two days, enabling him to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

4. Since it is not in dispute that prayer made on behalf of the petitioner to grant interim stay against the construction of road in question already stands rejected, prayer made by Mr. Neeraj Sharma, learned counsel representing petitioner, to pass fresh order thereby restraining the NHAI from carrying out construction at the spot cannot be considered without there being fresh application, if any, for grant of stay.

5. Needless to say, works of national importance, which include construction of National Highways, cannot be permitted to be hampered that too by the people, who have already received the adequate compensation qua their land, which ultimately is being used for construction of National Highway.

6. Reliance, in this regard, is placed upon judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **N.G. Projects Limited versus Vinod Kumar Jain & others, (2022) 6 SCC 127**, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court, while taking note of provisions contained under the Specific Relief Act, 1963, has categorically held that under Section 41(ha) of Specific Relief Act, which provides that if it would impede or delay the progress or completion of any infrastructure project or interfere with the continued provisions of relevant facility related thereto or services being the subject matter of such project, no request for interim relief shall be entertained.

7. List on **15.10.2026**. In the meantime, non-applicant/petitioner as well as non-applicant/respondent/State, besides taking action on the representation, if any, filed by the applicant/respondent No. 2, shall also file reply to the application.

CWP No. 2178 of 2026

8. Reply on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 5 is on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for and is granted four weeks' time to file rejoinder. In the meantime, respondents No. 6 to 8 may also file reply.

September 10, 2026
manjit

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge