



behalf of the respondents.

In view of the limited grievance raised during hearing of the writ petition and the order being passed hereinafter, reply of this writ petition is not required to be called from the respondents. Matter has accordingly been heard.

3. Petitioner was allotted an industrial plot on 21.03.2001 on lease hold basis, as per terms and conditions given in the allotment letter. It appears that petitioner could not comply with the terms and conditions of the allotment letter. Considering that petitioner was not interested to continue the project/running the unit, its allotment of plot was cancelled by respondent No.3 on 29.08.2025. Petitioner's representation against order dated 29.08.2025 was rejected by the Commissioner Industries, Himachal Pradesh on 13.01.2026. A further representation preferred by the petitioner was turned down by respondent No.1 on 03.03.2026. In the above background, petitioner has preferred this writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in the course of hearing its appeal/ representation before



respondent No.1, petitioner could not bring to the notice of the said authority several documents, which were in his possession to reflect that petitioner had started its unit and was functional. That had the above documents been before the Competent Authority, the decision on petitioner's representations might have been taken differently.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner would be satisfied in case it is permitted to make a fresh representation to respondent No.1, placing on record all available documents/evidence before it in order to show that petitioner's unit has already commenced its operation, and thereafter, respondent No.1 be directed to consider the same in accordance with law. Learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to the prayer.

5. In view of above submissions, but without examining the merits of the case, in the interest of justice and notwithstanding office order dated 03.03.2026, this writ petition is disposed of, reserving liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation to respondent No.1 within two weeks from today alongwith all available documents/evidence on the subject matter. In case such a representation is so made, the



same shall be decided by respondent No.1, in accordance with law, within three weeks thereafter after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. The decision so taken, be communicated to the petitioner.

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

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

March 25, 2026
R.Atal