

**State of Haryana vs. Prem Chand (deceased)
through LRs.**

RSA No. 513 of 2008

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Mohan Singh, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Prantap Sharma, Advocate, for respondents
No.1(a) and 1(b).

Mr. Aman Sood, Advocate, for respondents No.2 to
7.

At the request of learned counsel for the
appellant, the matter is adjourned for the day.

**(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge**

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Subhash Chander vs Himmat Singh

Cr. Revision No. 345 of 2014

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Amit Himalvi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Arsh Chauhan, Advocate, for respondent.

At the joint request of learned counsel for the parties, the matter is adjourned for the day.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Prem Chand Sharma vs State of H.P.

Cr.Appeal (A-SB) No. 37 of 2026

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Prantap Sharma, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, for
respondent No.1

None for remaining respondents.

As per office report, correct/complete address of
respondent No.4 has not been filed, hence, in terms of
order dated 12.08.2026; the present petition is dismissed
for want of prosecution.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Rakesh Walia vs. State of H.P.

Cr.Appeal No. 4001 of 2013

18.09.2026 Present:

None for the appellant.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, for respondent/State.

Case repeatedly called, but none is present on behalf of the appellant, hence, in these circumstances, the Secretary H.P. High Court Legal Services Committee, Shimla, H.P. is requested to appoint a Legal Aid Counsel to defend the appellant. List thereafter.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Dharam Chand vs. State of H.P. & others
Cr. Appeal No. 45 of 2014

18.09.2026 Present: Mr. Pawan Gautam, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, for the appellant No.1/State.

Mr. Divya Raj Singh, Advocate, for the respondents No.2, 4 and 5.

It appears from the record that the present appeal has been filed under Section 372 of Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.P.C). and the maintainability of the present petition before this Court is highly doubtful.

Heard. Reserved.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Manjeet Singh vs. State of H.P

Cr.Revision No. 125 of 2014

18.09.2026 Present:

Ms. Tamanna Sharma, Advocate, Legal Aid Counsel, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, for respondent/State.

Learned Legal Aid Counsel for the petitioner submits that compete paper book has been supplied to her.

At the request of learned Legal Aid Counsel, for the petitioner, list after two weeks.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

**Suresh Kumar vs. State of H.P. alongwith
connected matter.**

Cr.Revision Nos. 354 and 355 of 2015

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. R.K. Bawa, Senior Advocate with Mr. Abhinav Advocate, for the petitioner(s), both the petitioners.

Mr. Jitender K. Sharma, Additional Advocate General, for the respondents/State

As per report of the Registry, no appeal has been preferred by Babloo Kumar. Learned trial Court also informed that there is no receipt qua filing of appeal.

Learned trial Court is requested to take necessary steps for the execution of the sentence qua Babloo Kumar.

List the matter for hearing after four weeks.

**(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge**

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Dev Kumar vs. Durga Prasad

Cr.Revision No. 184 of 2026

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. H.S.Rangra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Case called repeatedly but none appeared on behalf of the petitioner despite service.

Let records of the learned Courts below be requisitioned and the matter be listed thereafter.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Yub Raj vs. H.P.Gramin Bank.

Cr.Revision No. 641 of 2024

18.09.2026 Present:

None for the petitioner.

Mr. K.B.Khajuria, Advocate, for the respondent.

Case repeatedly called but neither the petitioner is present nor any representation has been made on his behalf; hence, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjourned.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Prem Chand Sharma vs. State of H.P.

Cr.Appeal (A-SB) No. 37 of 2026

18.09.2026 Present:

None for the petitioner.

Mr. K.B.Khajuria, Advocate, for the respondent.

Case repeatedly called but neither the petitioner is present nor any representation has been made on his behalf; hence, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjourned.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Dinesh Kumar vs. Principal Secretary & Ors.

Cr.MMO No. 86 of 2018

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Mohinder Verma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, for the respondents No.1 to 3.

None for respondent No.4

Arguments heard. Judgment reserved.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

**Rameshwar (deceased) through LRs & Ors. vs.
Budhi Ram & Ors.**

RSA No. 14 of 2012

18.09.2026 Present:

None for the appellants.

Mr. Mohinder Verma, Advocate, for the respondent.

Since the original counsel representing the appellants has been designated as Senior Advocate.

No fresh power of attorney has been filed.

In view of above, issue actual date notice to the appellants, returnable within four weeks.

**(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge**

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Sukh Ram vs Satish

Cr.MP(M) No. 3066 of 2025

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Suresh Singh Saini, Advocate, for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Thakur, Advocate, for the non-applicant/respondent.

Learned counsel for the non-applicant submits that he does not want to file any reply to the application and he has no objection in case, the present application is allowed.

In view of above, the present application is allowed and the delay of 60 days in filing the present revision is ordered to be condoned.

The application stands disposed.

Cr. Revision No. _____ of 2026
[Cr.RST No. 12454 of 2025]

The delay in filing the present revision has been condoned as per order passed in Cr.MP(M) no. 3066 of 2025.

It be registered.

Copy of the petition be supplied to the learned counsel for the respondent.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties submit that the matter has been compromised between the parties.

In view of above, petitioner is directed to deposit 7.5% of the cheque amount before Member Secretary, H.P. Legal Services Authority, Kasumpti, Shimla,

as per the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sanjabij
Tari vs. Kishore S. Brocar and another (2025) SCC Online SC
2069*. List thereafter.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Subhash Chander vs. Himmat Singh

Cr.Revision No. 354 of 2014

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Amit Himalvi, a.

Mr. Prantap Sharma, Advocate, for respondents
No.1(a) and 1(b).

Mr. Aman Sood, Advocate, for respondents No.2 to
7.

At the request of learned counsel for the
appellant, the matter is adjourned for the day.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Vipan Kumar vs. State of H.P. & another

Cr.MMO No. 880 of 2026

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Surinder Saklani, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, for the respondent No.1

Ms. Nishi Goel, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Today separate statement of respondent No.2 has been recorded.

Perusal of the compromise deed shows that the compromise has effected on the monetary consideration.

List the matter for consideration after three weeks.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

Saurav Banerjeet & ors. vs. State of H.P. & Anr.

Cr.MMO No. 686 of 2025

18.09.2026 Present:

Mr. Sartej Narula, Senior Advocate with M/s. Sakshi Sharma, Shalini and Nandini, Advocates.

Mr. Jitender Sharma, Additional Advocate General, for respondent No.1/State.

Mr. Virender Thakur, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Arguments concluded. Judgment reserved.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 prays for
and is granted 5 days' time to file written synopsis.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

18.09.2026
(ravinder)

