IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

RP No.84 of 2026
Date of Decision: 18.11.2026

Sanjeev Chauhan **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioners: Mr. Dilip Sharma, Senior Advocate with Mr. Manish Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondent: Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General with Mr. R.P. Singh, Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the respondents-State.

Mr. Sunil Mohan Goel, Senior Advocate with Mr. Abhinav Mohan Goel, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Mr. Sparsh Bhushan, Advocate, for respondent No.5.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of instant review petition, filed under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, prayer has been made on behalf of the review petitioner for review of judgment dated 14.11.2025, passed by this Court in CWP No. 5988 of 2023, titled Sanjeev Chauhan versus State of H.P. and others.

2. Precisely, the case of the review petitioner, as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by Mr. Dilip Sharma, learned Senior Counsel representing the review petitioner, duly assisted by Mr. Manish Sharma, learned counsel, is that there is an error apparent on the face of the record, inasmuch as finding has been recorded in paragraph 26 of the judgment sought to be reviewed, which is contrary to the factual position. Mr. Sharma submitted that Rules of 2006 were not scrapped with the issuance of the Tenure Policy in 2009, rather after passing of the judgment by the Hon'ble Apex Court, posts of Lecturers on regular basis were filled up in accordance with the Rules of 2006. However, this Court proceeded to decide the entire controversy on the premise that Rules of 2006 stood scrapped with the issuance of the Tenure Policy in 2009, meaning thereby, there is an error apparent on the face of the record.

3. Learned counsel representing the respondents are also in agreement with the aforesaid submission made on behalf of the review petitioner.

4. In view of the above, this Court is persuaded to accept the prayer made on behalf of the review petitioner for recalling judgment dated 14.11.2025. Ordered accordingly. CWP Nos. 5988 of 2023, 677 of 2023 and 1587 of 2023 are ordered to be restored to their original numbers and

thereafter Registry shall list the same for fresh hearing before the Bench having roster to hear the cases. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

November 18, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(sunil) **Judge**