



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.10634 of 2025

Decided on: 28th November, 2025

Jaiky Ram

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P and others

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vikas Rathore, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Sikander Bhushan, Deputy Advocate General and Mr. Rajat Choudhry, Assistant Advocate General for respondents No. 1 to 4.

Mr. P.K. Verma, Advocate, for respondent No.5.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Heard. Petitioner, respondent No.5 alongwith others applied for the post of Van Mitra in District Chamba. Final result was declared on 20.11.2024. Petitioner secured 60.95 marks as against 62.65 marks obtained by respondent No.5. Respondent No.5 was selected and appointed as Van Mitra on 15.03.2025. Petitioner has assailed selection and appointment of respondent No.5 on the ground that he was wrongly awarded two marks for

¹Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.



belonging to Below Poverty Line(BPL) category. According to the petitioner, respondent No.5 does not belong to BPL category.

2. Respondents have filed reply and have also placed on record instructions dated 08.10.2025 alongwith certain documents. As per the instructions and the documents placed on record, at the time of selection, respondent No.5's family was in BPL category. In fact alongwith rejoinder, petitioner has placed on record BPL category certificate issued on 11.11.2024 reflecting respondent No.5 to be falling under BPL category. The selection process was culminated on 20.11.2024. The said BPL category certificate was valid on the date of culmination of selection process. In terms of instructions placed on record by the respondents, at present respondent No.5's family is not in the BPL category. Respondent No.5 in his reply has placed on record certificate issued on 26.07.2025 by the Secretary of concerned Gram Panchyat to the effect that it was on 18.06.2025 that respondent No.5's family was struck off from the BPL list.

3. In view of the above, it is to be held that respondent No.5 was correctly awarded two marks for belonging to BPL category on the date of evaluation of



documents/ culmination of selection process. Petitioner's challenge to respondent No.5's selection & appointment therefore fails.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner raises his grievance about validity of BPL category certificate issued to respondent No.5. In so far as this grievance is concerned, it is for the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law before appropriate Forum. With the aforesaid observations, the petition is disposed of. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also to stand disposed of.

November 28, 2025
yogesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge