

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA****CWP No. 8907 of 2023****Decided on: 06.05.2026**

Devender Singh

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others

... Respondents

Coram***Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.*****Whether approved for reporting?¹**

For the petitioner : Mr. Vinod Chauhan, Advocate.

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

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge *(Oral)*

By way of this writ petition, the petitioner has Assailed order dated 03.10.2023 (Annexure P-5), in terms whereof, the representation of the petitioner for his re-engagement/re-enrollment in Home Guards on the direction of the Court has been rejected on the ground that the re-engagement can only be if the incumbent happens to be above 18 years and below 50 years, whereas the petitioner has crossed the age of 50 years.

2. Learned Additional Advocate General has referred to Annexure R-7 appended with the reply, which is a copy of the judgment passed by Hon'ble Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No. 3214 of 2023, titled as Nanak Chand vs. State of H.P. and

¹ *Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*



others, decided on 21.08.2023 and submitted that said issue is no more *res integra* as the Hon'ble Coordinate Bench has been pleased to hold that a Home Guard volunteer can be enrolled only if the volunteer is above the age of 18 years and has not crossed the age of 50 years.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner could not dispute this fact and he candidly submitted that the relief prayed for by the petitioner is hit by said judgment of this Court.

4. Having heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and in light of the fact that the case of the petitioner for re-engagement as a Home Guard volunteer has been rejected by the Authority on the ground that the petitioner has crossed the age of 50 years and as the Hon'ble Coordinate Bench of this Court has held that the engagement of a Home Guard volunteer can only be done if the incumbent is above 18 years and has not crossed the age of 50 years, this Court does not find any illegality in the impugned order and this petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

May 06, 2026
(narender)