IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.17927 of 2026

Date of Decision: 08.10.2026

Yashwant Singh Negi …….Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & others … Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Anil Bansal and Mr. Sudhir Thakur, Advocates.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate Generals for the respondent-State.

Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate, for respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Notice at this stage is only confined to respondents No.1 to 4, which is waived by Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General and Mr. Deepak Sharma, learned counsel, respectively.

2. Having regard to the nature of the prayer and order proposed to be passed in the instant proceedings, this Court sees no necessity to call for the reply from the appearing respondents. Notice is also not required to be issued to respondent No.5.

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

3. The writ petition has been filed for the grant of following identical substantive relief:-

> " Issue a writ of mandamus directed to the respondent No.5 to pay compensation to the petitioners in terms of the office order passed by respondent No.1 on 09.04.2012(vide Annexure P-1) in the sum of Rs. 13.06 lacs towards damage to crop/horticulture produce and 766 lacs for loss of customary forest rights to the affected villagers due to project construction by the respondent No.5."

4. Petitioner seeks 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 submits that the petitioner has preferred his respective representation dated 24.08.2026 (Annexure P-3 colly) to respondent No.1, however, the same has not been considered and decided till date. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if the competent authority is directed to take an appropriate decision on the aforesaid representation of the petitioner, keeping in view Annexure P-2 and in accordance with law, within a time-bound manner. Learned counsel representing the respondents are not averse to aforesaid prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

5. Having regard to the above submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, the petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.3/competent authority to take an appropriate

decision on the aforesaid representation of the petitioner, keeping in view Annexure P-2 and in accordance with law, after associating all concerned stakeholders, including the petitioner 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.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 08,2026
(shankar)