IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20139 of 2026

Date of Decision: 06.11.2026

Beli Ram .…….Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & others … Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the Petitioner:	Mr. Shamul Kaushal, Advocate.
For the Respondents:	Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, for the respondent-State. Ms. Shreya Chauhan, Advocate, for respondent No.6.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that the petitioner would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide his pending representation dated 03.10.2026 (Annexure P-7), in a time-bound manner.

2. Learned Additional Advocate General representing respondents No. 1 to 5 and Ms. Shreya Chauhan, Advocate

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

representing respondent No. 6, fairly state that the representation, if not already decided, shall be decided expeditiously.

3. Having carefully perused the averments contained in the petition as well as documents annexed therewith, this Court finds that severe damage was caused to the residential and home stay building of the petitioner situate on Khasra Nos. 5344/ 3366, village Majharna, Post Office, Raila, Tehsil Sainj, District Kullu, due to lack of drainage and unscientific road construction by NHPC, Stage-II. Though, certain portion of land, as detailed hereinabove, stands acquired and compensation was paid but now dispute is only with regard to damage caused to the rest of the land and house. Though, at first instance, petitioner approached the competent authority for doing the needful, but since no action was taken, he is compelled to approach this Court in the instant proceedings.

4. Since the competent authorities are already seized of the matter, as is evident from the representation dated 03.10.2026, (Annexure P-7), this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the same with a direction to the respondents to ensure that the representation of the petitioner, as detailed hereinabove, is decided expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall

afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass appropriate order. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

November 06,2026
(shankar)