

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16180 of 2024

Date of Decision: 23.09.2026

Nishant Mehta

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sutlej Jal Vidyut Nigam Limited & others

... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Maan Singh, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Surender Sharma, Senior Advocate with Mr. Sidhant Negi, Advocate, for respondents No.1 to 3.

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

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant petition, petitioner has prayed for following main relief:-

“ That a writ in the nature of mandamus may very kindly be issued thereby directing the respondents to give appointment/ employment on regular basis to the petitioner, as per his qualification i.e. B. Tech(Mechanical) at the earliest, in terms of Resettlement and Rehabilitations Scheme.”

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

2. Precisely, the grouse of the petitioner as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by Mr. Maan Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, is that petitioner's land was acquired for the construction of Luhri Hydro Electric Project Stage -1 (210 MW) Compensation was paid to the petitioner. The petitioner and his family were rendered houseless & landless on account of acquisition of land. According to the petitioner, the respondents had framed a Scheme for Resettlement and Rehabilitation of the persons affected on account of construction of Luhri Hydro Electric Project Stage -1(210 MW) and, in terms of Clause-7(4) thereof, one member of each affected family was eligible for employment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that repeated representations have been preferred by the petitioner, seeking employment. Attention in this regard was invited to Annexure P-2. It appears that notice was issued on behalf of the petitioner vide Annexure P-2. The same was not responded to by the respondents.

4. Be that as it may, in the interest of justice, since respondent No.4-Deputy Commissioner, Shimla is the authorized officer under the Scheme in question, therefore, without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.4 to consider and decide the case of the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from today after associating all

stakeholders including respondent No.1 to 3. Needless to clarify that all rights and contentions of the parties on both sides are left open, as also the eligibility of the petitioner to claim the benefits under the Resettlement & Rehabilitation Scheme. The orders so passed shall also be communicated to the petitioner. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

September 23, 2026
(shankar)