

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

**CWP No. 4005/2025
Decided on: 10.07.2026**

Anjana Rohal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr.

.....Respondents

.....
Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner:

Mr. Deepak Gupta, Advocate,

For the respondents:

**Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional
Advocate General, for the
respondents-State.**

**Mr. P.S. Goverdhan, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Rakesh Thakur, Advocate
for respondents No.3 & 4.**

**Mr. Arun K. Verma, Advocate for
respondent No.5.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, J.

This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following
substantive reliefs: -

“ That the respondents may kindly be directed to register the FIR in case on the basis of complaint filed by the petitioner vide Annexure P-25 and quash Annexure P-26 the matter may kindly be investigated in accordance with law and culprits who are responsible for forging manufacturing, procuring and manipulating the records to usurp the misutilising the public funds in the interest of justice, equity and fair play.”

2. The petitioner served as Pradhan, Gram Panchayat Jalail, Tehsil and District Shimla, during the period 2018–2023. She filed a complaint against respondent No.3-Junior Engineer, Block Development Office, and respondent Nos.4 & 5-former Panchayat representatives, alleging irregularities in the construction of Bheem Rao Ambedkar Bhawan as well as in the construction of a playground near Hanuman Mandir. The complaint was verified by the State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau (SV & ACB), H.P., Shimla. The verification report was prepared on 28.10.2024. After examining the said report, the Director General of SV & ACB, H.P., recommended as under: -

“Recommendation: -

The instant matter has been examined in VHQ and it is revealed that there is no vigilance angle involved in the matter. As such, the instant matter is closed in the Bureau and forwarded to your department to look into the matter at your end. In case any vigilance angle found involved in the matter it may be sent back to this Bureau with permission u/s 17A of PC Act please.”

The petitioner feels aggrieved with the above recommendations.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the SV & ACB Department could not have forwarded the complaint to the administrative department, i.e. the Panchayati Raj Department. Rather, in consonance with the notification dated 15.11.2006, whereunder the Vigilance and Enforcement Departments were merged into a single

department, the SV & ACB Department ought to have itself taken the matter to its logical conclusion.

4. During hearing of the case, learned Additional Advocate General placed on record an internal office letter dated 29.08.2025 issued by the Panchayati Raj Department, conveying that further action can be taken only after the decision in the present writ petition. The said approach of the Panchayati Raj Department may not be correct, as there was no interim order restraining it from proceeding appropriately in the matter. In fact, the Panchayati Raj Department is not even a party-respondent to the present writ petition.

In terms of the impugned office letter dated 18.01.2025, the Vigilance Department has forwarded the matter to the Panchayati Raj Department to examine the same at its end, with further remarks that in case any vigilance angle is still found involved, the case may be sent back to the Vigilance Bureau in accordance with law.

In view of above, this writ petition is disposed of with direction to the State Panchayati Raj Department to be conveyed through the office of the learned Advocate General to examine the complaint made by the petitioner, in accordance with law, *inter alia*, keeping in view the verification report of the State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau, and to take further action as deemed fit. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

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

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

10th July, 2026 (rohit)