

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**CWP No.1432 of 2026****Date of Decision: 31.08.2026**

Girdhari Lal Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. ... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Rahul, Advocate vice Mr. R.L.Chaudhary, Advocate.

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

Mr. Hamender Singh Chandel, Advocate, for respondents No.3 and 4.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, petitioner has prayed for the following main reliefs: -

"j) That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondent authorities to decide the application of the petitioner Annexure P-3 of Annexure P-1 by taking into consideration the Rehabilitation Scheme Annexure P-2 of Annexure P-1, since in terms of the Rehabilitation Scheme, the respondent authorities have provided employment to other affected persons namely;

*Sh. Dhyan Singh son of Sh. Man Chand
Sh. Suresh Kumar son of Sh. Dabe Ram
Sh. Thakur Dass son of Sh. Alam Chand,*

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

*Sh. Ghanshyam son of Sh. Gian Chand and
Sh. Girdhari Lal son of Sh. Dhale Ram.*

ii) That the writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondent authorities to provide employment to the petitioner within time bound manner in terms of the Rehabilitation Scheme i.e. Annexure P-2 of Annexure P-1, since in terms of the Rehabilitation Scheme, the respondent authorities have provided employment to other affected persons namely;

Sh. Dhyam Singh son of Sh. Man Chand

Sh. Suresh Kumar son of Sh. Dabe Ram

*Sh. Thakur Dass son of Sh. Alam Chand,
Sh. Ghanshyam son of Sh. Gian Chand and*

Sh. Girdhari Lal son of Sh. Dhale Ram.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has represented vide Annexure P-3 to respondent No.2 for providing employment to him, who falls within the definition of landless persons or whose source of livelihood came to an end due to the construction of the project. However, till date, the said representation has not been taken to its logical end and has not been responded to by the competent authority.

3. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.3 and 4 has apprised the Court that under the Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project affected families of Parbati Hydro Electric project Scheme (Annexure P-2) of respondent No.2, it is respondent No.5-Deputy Commissioner, Kullu, who is the competent authority to decide such representation as moved by the petitioner vide Annexure P-3.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner would be content and satisfied in case respondent No.5/competent authority is directed to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law and the applicable policy, in a time-bound manner.

5. Learned counsel representing the respondents is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

6. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to direct respondent No.5-Deputy Commissioner, Kullu/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner within a period of eight weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner as well as respondents No.3 and 4.

7. All contentions of the parties are left open. The order so passed, shall also be communicated to the parties. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

August 31, 2026
(shankar)