IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CR No. 84 of 2025
Date of decision:15.09.2026

Lal Singh & others ...Petitioners.

Versus

State of H.P. & another ...Respondents.

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Romesh Verma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioners: Ms. Dhanwanti Devi, Advocate, vice Mr. Sanjay Bhardwaj, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Diwakar Dev Sharma, Additional Advocate General.

Romesh Verma, Judge(oral)

The instant petition arises out of the order dated 10th March, 2025, passed by the learned Additional District Judge-I, Solan, H.P., whereby the execution petition filed by the present petitioners was consigned to the record room as partly satisfied, with liberty reserved to the present petitioners to file an execution petition afresh within a period of 30 days, if so desired.

2. During the pendency of the present petition, this Court had passed an order dated 29th May 2026 in the following manner:-

> *"In present case, the dispute primarily pertains to the calculation inter se the parties. The present petition has been filed by the present petitioners against the dismissal of the execution petition vide order dated 10.03.2025, as passed by learned Additional District Judge, Solan, District Solan, H.P.*

[1] Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 07/11/2026 19:50:05 :::CIS

It has been held by learned Additional District Judge, Solan, District Solan, H.P. that the calculations filed by the present petitioner were found to be, prima facie, incorrect.

The present petition has been preferred by the petitioner on the ground that the impugned order dated 10.03.2025 is erroneous and liable to be quashed and set-aside and they are entitled to get the amount of compensation on account of land acquistiion.

The said contention has been specifically refuted by learned Deputy Advocate General.

On the last date of hearing, this Court has passed the following Order:

> *"It is contended by the learned Deputy Advocate General that since the issue pertains to the calculation interse between the parties, therefore, the Registry of this Court can be directed to calculate the amount as alleged by the present petitioners and the respondents as per law.*
>
> *Faced with above situation, learned vice counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks time to have instructions in the matter. List next week."*

Therefore, as agreed by the respective parties, the Registry is directed to carry out the calculations inter se the parties and submit a report on or before the next date of hearing.

Learned counsel for the parties are directed to supply the entire record to the Registry and assist them in doing the needful.

List on 19.06.2026."

3. In pursuance to the direction of this Court, the Registry had made the report that the balance amount of compensation which is required to be paid by the LAC comes to ₹6,74,618/-.

High Court of Hp

::: Downloaded on - 07/11/2026 19:50:05 :::CIS

4. Since the order which was passed by this Court on 29th May 2026 was a consent order, therefore, directions were issued to the respondents to comply with the same whereby the Registry had calculated the amount of compensation.

5. Today, the learned Additional Advocate General has placed on record the copy of the office order as passed by the Executive Engineer regarding deposit of the deficient amount of ₹6,74,618/- in the present petition.

6. Since the said amount has been deposited by the State before the Registry of this Court, therefore, the present petition is disposed of, and the impugned order which was passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Court No. 1, Solan, is quashed and set aside in view of the compliance made by the State.

The petition stands disposed of along with any pending application(s).

(Romesh Verma)
Judge

September 15, 2026
(Nisha)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 07/11/2026 19:50:05 :::CIS