

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

**CWP No. 14572/2026 and connected matters
Decided on: 24.08.2026**

1. CWP No. 14572/2026

Thakur Lal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

2. CWP No. 14573/2026

Bala Bir ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

3. CWP No. 14574/2026

Shari Chand ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

4. CWP No. 14575/2026

Lal Singh Bilyan ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

5. CWP No. 14576/2026

Chander Bhagat ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

6. CWP No. 14577/2026

Hoshiyar Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

7. CWP No. 14578/2026

Rajinder Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

8. CWP No. 14579/2026

Ganesh Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. Respondents.

.....
Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

**For the petitioner(s): Mr. Anil Bansal and Mr. Naveen
Negi, Advocates, in all the
petitions.**

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

For the respondent(s): Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No.1 & 4 in all the petitions

Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate for respondents No. 2 & 3, in all the petitions.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, J.

Notice confined to respondents No.1 to 4, which is waived by Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General and Mr. Deepak Sharma, learned counsel, respectively.

Considering the grievance of the petitioner(s) and the nature of the order being passed hereinafter, there is no necessity to call for the reply from the appearing respondents. Notice is also not required to be issued to respondent No.5 in all the petitions. The matters have been accordingly heard at this stage.

2. These writ petitions have been filed for the grant of following identical substantive relief (Prayer has been extracted from CWP No. 14572/2026: -

“Issue a writ of mandamus directed to the respondent No.5 to pay compensation to the petitioner in terms of the office order passed by the respondent No.1 on 09.04.2012 (vide Annexure P-1) in the sum of Rs.1306 Lacs towards damage to

crop/horticulture produce and 766 Lacs for loss of customary Forest rights to the affected villages due to project construction by the respondent No.5.”

3. Petitioner(s) seek parity viz-a-viz those who find mention in the office order dated 27.01.2018 (Annexure P-2) for claiming compensation for the alleged crop losses on account of setting up of the Hydro Electric Project by respondent No.5. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the petitioner(s) have preferred their respective representations dated 21.07.2026 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.1 annexed in all the writ petitions, however, the same have not been considered and decided till date. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the petitioners would be satisfied if the competent authority is directed to take an appropriate decision on the aforesaid representations of the petitioner(s), keeping in view Annexure P-2 and in accordance with law, within a time-bound manner.

Learned counsel for the respondents have no objection to this prayer.

4. Having regard to the above submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, these instant petitions are disposed of by directing respondent No.3/competent authority to take an appropriate decision on

the aforesaid representations of the petitioner(s), keeping in view Annexure P-2 and in accordance with law, after associating all concerned stakeholders, including the petitioner(s) and respondent No.5, within a period of eight weeks from today. The order so passed shall also be communicated to the parties. Needless to clarify that all rights and contentions of the parties, including the issue of delay and laches, are also left open. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

24th August, 2026_(R.Atal)