IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.6155 of 2026

Decided on: 27.04.2026

Ajit Singh and others **…..Petitioners**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioners: Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional Advocate General, Ms. Menka Raj Chauhan and Ms. Seema Sharma, Deputy Advocates General for respondents No. 1 & 2.

Mr. R.K. Gautam, Senior Advocate with Mr. Jai Ram Sharma, Advocate, for respondents No. 3 to 6.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. L.N. Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General and Mr. Jai Ram Sharma, learned counsel, appear and waive service of notice on behalf of the respondents No. 1, 2 & 3 to 6, respectively.

2. Learned counsel for the parties stated at the Bar that similar matters were considered by this Court in a batch of cases, lead case of which is ***Bakshi Ram vs.***

[1]Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.

Union of India[2] and prayed that this writ petition be disposed of in terms of the judgment (supra). Their statements are taken on record.

3. It is apt to reproduce herein relevant portion of the judgment referred to above: -

> "2. It is not in dispute that after the judgment rendered by the Apex Court in Pradesh Pong Bandh Visthapit Samiti, Rajasthan & Another versus Union of India & Others, (1996) 9 Supreme Court Cases 749, a high power committee has been constituted to look into the grievance of the petitioners and similar situate persons. This committee is still functional.
>
> Accordingly, the petitioners are permitted to make representation(s) before the high power committee. The committee shall look into the grievance of the petitioners and similar situate persons within a period of six months after receipt of the representation(s). The committee shall also be guided by the judgment rendered by this Court in CWP No.492 of 2007, titled as "Ashwani Kumar V. Union of India", decided on 29.3.2011, against which an SLP was preferred which was dismissed by Hon'ble Supreme Court on 2.1.2013. It is made clear that the limitation/delay shall not come in the way of the petitioner(s). It is also made clear that the high power committee shall decide the cases individually and pass speaking/detailed order(s), strictly as per the averments made in the representation(s). It is further clarified that if the land is available in Sriganganagar (reserved area), this aspect shall also be taken into consideration. The respondent-State is also directed to issue the eligibility certificate in favour of the petitioners in CWPs No.11070 of 2011-G and 1158 of 2013 in order to enable them to present their cases before the high power committee."

---

[2]CWP No.1540/2013, decided on 06.11.2013.

4. It is also stated that the judgment referred to above was also followed by the Division Bench of this Court and upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a judgment rendered in ***State of Rajasthan & another vs. Ashwani Kumar Sharma & others***[3] and the Special Leave Petition was dismissed.

5. In the given circumstances, this writ petition is disposed of in terms of the aforesaid judgment in ***Bakshi Ram's*** case, supra, with liberty to the writ petitioner to file representation within four weeks before the High Power Committee. The said Committee is directed to decide the same within a period of three months thereafter. The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioner. The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

April 27, 2026
yogesh

[3]SLP(C) No.21904/2013 , decided on 02.01.2013.