

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Civil Writ Petition No.15306 of 2026

Date of Decision: 03.09.2026

Smt. Deepika

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Sambhav Bhasin, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar,
Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi
Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy
Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Though prima facie this Court is of the view that present petition is not maintainable, however, having taken note of innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner to issue direction to respondent No.2 to decide the pending representations (Annexure P-2 and P-3), this court sees no necessity to call for reply on behalf of respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General.

2. Precisely, the grouse of the petitioner, as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by learned counsel for the petitioner, is that despite there being repeated requests made to respondent No. 2 for attestation of the mutation in respect of land

comprised in old Khatauni No. 313/1 and new Khasra No. 371/1, measuring 3 Kanal 8 Marla, situate at Mohal Siddhpur, Mouza Khanyara, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, the needful has not been done.

3. Consequently, in view of above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 to consider and decide pending representation of the petitioner (Annexures P-2 and P-3), if not already decided, expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks in accordance with law. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass appropriate orders. Application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

September 03, 2026
(sunil)