

2026:HHC:14767

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

CWP No. 6702 of 2026

Date of Decision : 05.05.2026

Dinesh Glass Industries*Petitioner*

Versus

Union of India & others ...*Respondents.*

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice.
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bipin C. Negi, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner:	Mr. Hakam Bhardwaj, Advocate.
---------------------	----------------------------------

For the Respondents:	Mr. Shiv Pal Manhans, Senior Panel Counsel, for respondents No. 1 & 2.
----------------------	--

	Mr. Pranay Pratap Singh, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No. 3 & 4.
--	---

G.S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice *(Oral)*

In the present writ petition, letters dated 30.07.2024 (Annexure P-10) and 09.11.2023 (Annexure P-11) are subject matter of challenge, whereby the

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

petitioner's case for registration of its project was rejected under the Industrial Development Scheme, 2017.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that in similar circumstances in **LPA No. 169 of 2025**, titled as **Union of India & another Vs. Atul Shrma and others alongwith connected matters**, decided on 16.07.2025, the order passed by the learned Single Judge was upheld, whereby the consideration had to be done in terms of the Policy dated 23.04.2018. The relevant portion of the said judgment reads as under:

"10. Learned Single Judge found that the appellant Union of India could not in the first set of cases, deny the fact that the applications had been forwarded during currency of the Scheme and therefore, consideration had not been done. In such circumstances, he came to the conclusion that at least the consideration had to be made as per the terms of the policy dated 23.04.2018 (Annexure P-1). Thus, we cannot find any fault as such with the reasoning of the learned Single Judge to this extent.

11. Counsel for Union of India also admits that since each and every individual case will have to be considered within the parameters of the

said policy, it would be appropriate that a decision making is done by the Empowered Committee by fixing a time frame as such. We are also of the considered opinion that the findings as such that the consideration was to be done by the Empowered Committee, thus cannot be faulted in any manner, once it is the case of the State also that they had forwarded their cases to the Empowered Committee. If that is so, then the decision making as such had to be done as per the parameters of the notification and as noticed above, has now been done in one case though, the rejection is here.

12. In such circumstances, we are of the considered opinion that present LPAs are liable to be disposed of in the above terms along with writ petitions that each and every individual case has to be considered afresh by the Empowered Committee. Let the said exercise be done within a period of four months from today. Needless to say that it will be open to the applicants, as such, to seek their remedy in accordance with law in case there is rejection of their case.

13. All pending applications stand disposed of accordingly."

3. Keeping in view the fact that the judgment in the aforesaid LPA has further been upheld by the Apex Court in ***Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.***

65239/2025, titled as ***Union of India & another Vs. Atul Sharma & others***, on 30.01.2026, we dispose of the present petition, directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner in terms of the aforesaid judgment.

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

(G.S. Sandhawalia)
Chief Justice.

May 05, 2026
(hemlata)

(Bipin C. Negi)
Judge.