IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 14076 of 2024

Decided on: 04.11.2025

Him Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner	:	Mr. G.R. Palsra, Advocate.
For the respondents	:	Mr. Rajat Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge *(Oral)*

By way of this writ petition, the petitioner has *inter alia* prayed for the following relief:-

> *"That the respondents may kindly be directed to directed to attest the mutation of the sanctioned land bearing Khasra WCL 2/2 jadeed measuring 8-16-0 bigha situated in Mohal Chohat/522, Sub Tehsil Baga Chanogi, Tehsil Thunag, District Mandi, H.P. in favour of the petitioner and proforma respondents No. 5 to 7 by issuing a writ of mandamus."*

2. In the reply filed by respondents No. 1, 3 and 4, the following is stated in para-3 of the preliminary submissions:-

> *"3. That Sh. Manghru grandfather of the petitioner had applied for grant of Nautor land on 16.01.1967 of 20 land*

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

2025:HHC:37040

bearing Khasra No. 2/2 Jadeed measuring 8-16-0 bighas, situated in Village Chohat, Tehsil Chachiot (Now Thunag), District Mandi, H.P. for agriculture purposes. Thereafter, the Revenue Assistant Tehsil Chachiot, District Mandi, H.P. has granted 8-4-2 bighas land in favour of Shri Mangru grandfather of petitioner vide order dated 19.10.1970 and Nazarana to the tune of Rs. 410.25 was also deposited by Shri Manghru. However it is submitted that the category of said Nautor land prior to Bandobast was "Charaghah Billa Drakhtan" and further converted into "Jangal Maihfooja Gair Maihduda". Therefore, for the attestation of mutation correspondence was made to the Additional Chief Secretary (Revenue) to the Government of H.P. for direction in 39 cases (including the case of Sh. Manghru S/o Shri Jethu) which are pending for attestation of mutation as sanctioned in Nautor scheme before the Cenforcement of Forest Conservation Act, 1980."

3. Having heard learned Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Assistant Advocate General and having perused the pleadings and more so, the reply filed by the respondents No. 1, 3 and 4, this Court is of the considered view that the Authority concerned has to take some call on the request of the party for attestation of the mutation one way or the other. The same cannot be kept pending for eternity. Once a decision is taken by the Authority, then, in case, the petitioner is not satisfied with the same, at least he

2025:HHC:37040

can avail the appropriate remedy against the same. However, if no decision is taken on the request of the petitioner, then obviously, the petitioner has a genuine grievance because prayer for attestation of mutation cannot be kept in abeyance for ever.

Accordingly, in view of above observations, this petition is disposed of with direction that let the Authority take a call on the issue of attestation of mutation within a period of eight weeks from today, in accordance with law. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

November 04, 2025
(*narender*)