

RADHA DEVI Versus THE DC CHAMBA AND OTHERS

CWP-14824 of 2025

11.09.2026 Present: Mr. Anuj Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for respondents-State.

Ms. Suman Thakur, Advocate, for the applicant in CMP No.27854 of 2025.

CMP-27854 of 2025

By way of instant application filed under Order I Rule 10 CPC, prayer has been made on behalf of applicant/proposed respondent No. 4 for his impleadment as a party respondent.

Despite sufficient opportunities, no reply has been filed. Learned counsel representing the non-applicant/petitioner fairly states that he has no objection to the prayer made in the application and the same may be allowed.

Having carefully perused the reasons assigned in the application for impleadment of applicant/proposed respondent No.4 as party respondent, this Court sees no impediment in accepting the prayer made on behalf of the applicant/ petitioner.

In view of the above, present application is allowed and Ramesh Kumar is ordered to be impleaded as party respondent No. 4. Registry to carry out necessary corrections in the memo of parties on the basis of amended memo of parties to

be filed by learned counsel for the petitioner. Application stands disposed of.

CWP-14824 of 2025

Since Ms. Suman Thakur, Advocate, has instructions to appear on behalf of newly impleaded respondent No. 4, no notice is required to be issued to him. However, while filing reply, if any, to the petition, above named counsel may also file Power of Attorney, if not already filed.

Learned Additional Advocate General to have instructions “whether inquiry ordered to be initiated against petitioner vide letter dated 15.09.2025 under Section 145(3) of the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj Act has been concluded or not?” If not, why suspension of the petitioner has not been revoked in terms of Section 145(3) of Panchayati Raj Act, which provides that inquiry is to be concluded within a period of six months, failing which suspension order is to be revoked.

List on 28.09.2026. It is made clear that in case no instructions are imparted, this Court would proceed to decide the case in accordance with law.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

September 11, 2026
(Sunil)