**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**CWP No.16593 of 2026**
**Date of Decision: 24.9.2026**

---

**Brij Pal Singh**

**.....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.**

**.....Respondents**

---

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

**For the Petitioner:** Mr. Parveen Chandel, Advocate.

**For the Respondents:** Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General.

---

**Sandeep Sharma, J.** *(Oral)*

Through present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has made a very innocuous prayer for issuing direction to respondents No. 3 and 4 to decide his pending application for execution of warrant of possession issued pursuant to final partition order dated 26.06.2023 passed in revenue case No. 9/9 of 2021.

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity to call for reply on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Anish Banshtu, learned Deputy Advocate General. Since no order prejudicial is

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 08/11/2026 09:46:43 :::CIS

proposed to be passed against respondent No. 5 in the instant proceedings, it is also not necessary to issue notice to him at this stage, rather he shall be heard in the appropriate proceedings pending before the competent authority.

3. In nutshell, case of the petitioner as emerges from pleadings as well as other material adduced on record by the parties is that pursuant to application for partition made by the petitioner, partition proceedings have been concluded, but yet petitioner has not been given possession of land which has fallen in his share in the partition proceedings. Though warrant of possession stands issued pursuant to final partition order dated 26.06.2023 passed in revenue case No. 9/9 of 2021, but fact remains that same has not been executed till date. In the aforesaid background, petitioner has been compelled to approach this Court by way of instant proceedings.

4. Learned Deputy Advocate General, states that though he has reason to presume and believe that by now needful must have been done, but if not, same shall be done expeditiously.

5. Consequently, in view of above, this Court, without going into merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the same with direction to respondents No. 3 and 4 to ensure that warrant of possession issued

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 08/11/2026 09:46:43 :::CIS

pursuant to final partition order dated 26.06.2023, if not already executed, is executed expeditiously, preferably within a period of three months. Ordered accordingly.

Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**September 24, 2026** **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(manjit) **Judge**

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 08/11/2026 09:46:43 :::CIS