IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.1286 of 2019
Date of Decision: 07.10.2026

Rozi Sadana

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and Ors.

.....Respondents

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Sudhir Thakur, Senior Advocate with Mr. Somesh Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Shyam Singh Chauhan, Central Government Counsel, for respondent No.1-Union of India.

Ms. Shreya Chauhan, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Mr. Ajay Kumar, Senior Advocate with Mr. Vinay Kumar Thakur, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Mr. Sudhir Thakur, learned Senior Counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, fairly states that grievance of the petitioner has been partially addressed, inasmuch as she has been paid compensation for the land used for construction of the National Highway. He states that now the dispute remains with regard to damage caused to rest of her land on account of unscientific cutting and throwing of the debris and as such, Committee Constituted under the Chairmanship of the Deputy

Commissioner, Solan, which is otherwise authorized to assess the damage, if any, caused to the property beyond right of way be directed to treat the present petition as representation on behalf of the petitioner and decide the same in a time bound manner.

2. Learned counsel representing the respondents are not averse to aforesaid prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

3. Consequently, In view of the above, present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Committee notified under notification dated 08.06.2020 headed by the Deputy Commissioner of the concerned district, to treat the present petition as a representation on behalf of the petitioner and thereafter, assess the damage, if any, caused to the property of the petitioner beyond the right of way or for removal of debris allegedly thrown by respondent No.2-NHAI. The Committee shall decide the same expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of the instant order shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner as well as other stakeholders. Liberty is also reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings before the appropriate court of law if she still remains aggrieved.

October 07, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(manjit) **Judge**