

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.17267 of 2026
Date of Decision: 30.9.2026

M/s MSC Roads and Bridges (P) Ltd.

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Anr.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Ajay Vaidya, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Precisely, the grouse of the petitioner as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by Mr. Ajay Vaidya, learned counsel representing the petitioner, is that despite there being directions contained in judgment dated 03.08.2026 passed by Division Bench of this Court in CWP No. 8789 of 2026 titled as *M/s MSC Road and Bridges (P) Ltd. vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others*, representation/reply filed by the petitioner well within time is not being decided, as a result thereof, petitioner is continuously suffering huge financial losses.

2. Mr. Anup Rattan, learned Advocate General, representing the respondents-State, states that since information, as sought for, is not being supplied by the petitioner, department has not been able to dispose of representation/reply within the stipulated time.

3. Mr. Ajay Vaidya, learned counsel representing the petitioner states that no information or documents, if any, were ever called from the petitioner till yesterday, but it is only after filing of the present petition, one communication dated 29.09.2026 has been sent, thereby calling upon the petitioner to make available certain documents. He states that since Division Bench of this Court, having taken note of pleadings in the previous case vis a vis relief prayed for, has already directed the respondents-State to decide representation/reply, no further information as has been sought for is required to be made available by the petitioner.

4. Having carefully perused judgment dated 03.08.2026, this Court finds that there was a specific direction to the respondents to decide representation/reply of the petitioner within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of the same. It is not in dispute that pursuant to directions contained in aforesaid judgment, the petitioner herein filed reply to the show cause notice within a period of two weeks i.e. 11.08.2026 and as such, the respondents ought to have decided the same on or before

03.09.2026, but since needful has not been done, petitioner is compelled to approach this Court in the instant proceedings.

5. Learned Advocate General states that needful, as has been ordered to be done by the Division Bench, shall be done expeditiously.

6. Consequently, in view of above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to do the needful in terms of judgment dated 03.08.2026 expeditiously, preferably within a period of ten days. Ordered accordingly. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

September 30, 2026

(manjit)

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**