

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP No.4325 of 2026

Decided on 21st April 2026

Ramesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others

...Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge

¹Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner: Mr. Naveen K. Bhardwaj, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, Additional
Advocate General.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral)

By way of this writ petition, the petitioner has, inter alia, prayed for the following reliefs:-

- (I) *"That Annexure P-3 dated 03.07.2019 may kindly be quashed and set aside.*
- (II) *That the respondents may be directed to offer appointment to the petitioner as per his qualification forthwith, under the scheme framed by them for providing employment assistance on compassionate grounds."*

2. Though, the case relates to the rejection of the claim of the petitioner for grant of appointment on compassionate basis, but, this rejection is dated 03.07.2019.

3. On a query put to the learned counsel, as to how the petitioner justify the delay in assailing order dated 03.07.2019, learned counsel referred to the averments made in the writ petition and submitted that the petitioner was never informed by the Authority that his case was rejected and he was always kept under the illusion that the case is still pending.

4. Learned counsel further submitted that it was only when the petitioner discussed his case with one Sh. Sudhir Sharma, at Chamba, who happens to be a lawyer, that he came to know about the rejection of his case in the month of January, 2026.

5. This Court is not convinced with the said explanation, for the reason that there was no occasion for the authority to hide the fact of rejection of the case of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate basis.

6. Secondly, it is not the contention of the petitioner that case regarding compassionate appointment was being pursued by him with the Department through Sh. Sudhir Sharma, Advocate.

7. Therefore, this Court fails to understand as to what was the magic formula available with Sh. Sudhir Sharma, Advocate, who after the petitioner purportedly met him immediately informed the petitioner that his case for compassionate appointment stood dismissed.

8. The above demonstrates that what has been mentioned in the petition is nothing but a concocted story and as the Court does not find any substance therein, the present petition is dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

April 21, 2026
(*Vinod*)