IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH
SHIMLA

Ex. Petition No. 2496 of 2026

Date of decision: 15.10.2026.

Bagga Ram ...Petitioner.

Versus

State of H.P. & others ...Respondents.

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner : Mr. Jai Ram Sharma, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Varun Chandel, Additional Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge:

Petitioner has come up before this Court, seeking execution and implementation of the order/judgment dated 04.05.2026 [Annexur E-1], passed in CWP No. 6531 of 2026, titled as *Bagga Ram & another versus State of Himachal Pradesh & others*, whereby, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had passed the following orders:-

> "4. The writ petition does not disclose as to whether the petitioners ever represented to the respondents with their grievances. Therefore, at this stage, it will be in the interest of justice to reserve liberty to the petitioners to represent to the respondents No.2 & 3/Competent

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

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 08:32:30 :::CIS

> Authority with their grievances including prayer for demarcation of the land. In case such a representation is made by the petitioners within three weeks from today, the same shall be considered and decided by respondents No.2 & 3/Competent Authority in accordance with law, within six weeks thereafter, after verification as to whether any portion of the land of the petitioners has been utilized for the construction of the road".

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of order dated 05.05.2026 [Annexure P-1], petitioner has submitted a representation to the Respondents/Competent Authority on 14.05.2026 [Annexure P-2] and a reminder on 27.07.2026 [Annexure P-3], but the same have not been decided despite the directions passed by this Court.

3. Heard.

4. Notice. Mr. Varun Chandel, Learned Additional Advocate General waives service of notice on behalf of respondents.

5. At this stage, Learned Counsel for the petitioner, on Instructions, states that petitioner shall be satisfied, in case, the Respondents are directed to implement the order/judgment in a time bound manner. [*Statement Taken On Record].*

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 08:32:30 :::CIS

6. Prayer, being innocuous, is not opposed by Learned State Counsel also.

7. Considering the matter in above perspective, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to the Respondents-Competent Authority to implement the order/judgment within a period of six weeks from today.

8. In case, any grievance still remains, the petitioner may seek appropriate remedy, hereinafter, in accordance with law.

9. In aforesaid terms, the instant petition stands disposed of, alongwith pending applications, if any.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

October 15, 2026.
(kck)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 08:32:30 :::CIS