

No.Ft.48-3223/2015 (FCA)
H.P. Forest Department.

Forest Department, Himachal Pradesh

From: Pr. Chief Conservator of Forests (HoFF),
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-1.

To: The Deputy Inspector General of Forest,
Sub Office, Ministry of Environment,
Forest and Climate Change, CGO Complex,
Shivalik Khand, Longwood, Shimla, HP.

Dated Shimla-1, the

Subject: Diversion of 0.0422 ha. of forest land in favour HPPWD for c/o of Panyali to
Nugran road Km 0/00 to 2/0 under PMGSY, within the jurisdiction of
Hamirpur Forest Division. (Proposal No. FP/HP/Road/15823/2015).

Sir,

Kindly refer to your office letter I/60713/2023 dated 22.12.2020. on the
subject cited proposal.

2. The point wise reply to the observation as raised vide your above referred
communication is submitted as below: -

1. In this context, it submitted that the user agency has provided the length and
width of the proposed area vide its letter No. PW/BSR/ WA//FCA/ 2024-
25/912 dated 18.06.2024 (copy enclosed) which is as under 1. RD 0/00 to
0/066 Km = Forest land (Violated) 2. RD 0/066 to 2/00 Km = Non-Forest
Land (Sr. No.5 of Additional Information Online Part-I).
2. In this context, it is submitted that the user agency has uploaded the documents
online Part I (Sr. No.4 of Additional Information Online Part-I) :-
i) Copies of the order of the Hon'ble High court of HP which mention of
regularization of 2183 roads that have already been constructed in violation of
the provisions of FCA, 1980 is attached herewith.

ii) Complete legible list of 2183 roads provided by HPPWD to Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh highlighting the Hamirpur Circle at SN.1 and the name of the road is enclosed along with.

Encl: As above

Yours faithfully,

Signed by

Sanjay Sood

Date: 19-03-2025 16:26:53

Nodal Officer-cum-PCCF (FCA)
O/o Pr. CCF (HoFF), H.P.

FOR GENERAL

Section Officer
HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH
DATED

38-38
6540
3/05/12

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA.

C.W.P. No. 5600 of 2012.

Manoj Kumar, S/o Shri Shiv Charan,
R/o Vill. Naddi, P.O. Dall Lake,
Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.

Petitioner.

Versus

CANCEL

FILED

1. Union of India through Secretary,
Ministry of Environment & Forests,
Government of India,
New Delhi.
2. State of Himachal Pradesh through
Chief Secretary to the
Government of Himachal Pradesh,
Shimla-171002.
3. The Secretary (Forest) to the
Government of Himachal Pradesh,
Shimla-171002.
4. The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests,
Himachal Pradesh,
Talland, Shimla-171002.
5. Shri A.R.S. Reddy,
Conservator of Forests,
Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.
6. The Divisional Forest Officer,
Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.
7. The Range Officer,
Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.
8. The Superintendent of Police,
District Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.
9. Kumari Bhawana, D/o Shri Kuldeep Singh,
R/o Vill. Satobari, P.O. Dall Lake,
Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.
10. Shri Mohan Lal Tikku, S/o Shri Shambhu Nath,
R/o Vill. Satobari, P.O. Dall Lake,
Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.

FILED TODAY
23 AUG 2012
Reader to Registrar

Recd
to Secy
22/8/2012

M-16624
23/8/12

Respondents.

Certified copy of all summons orders passed by
The Hon'ble Courts

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171002

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Date

Order

CWP No. 5600 of 2012-I

2012

Present:

Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate, Central Government Standing Counsel, for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Vivek S. Thakur, Additional Advocate General with Mr. Rajesh Mandhotra, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.

This matter is a Green Bench matter. Since, this Bench is also a special Green Bench and urgency is involved herein, we have taken up the matter.

Mr. Anup Rattan learned Central Government Standing Counsel waives service of notice on behalf of respondent No. 1. Mr. Vivek S. Thakur, learned Additional Advocate General waives service of notice on behalf of respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8. Dasti notice be issued to respondent No. 5, returnable for **3.8.2012**.

The petitioner is directed to ensure that the persons/hoteliers, against whom the allegations have been made, are made party to the present writ petition. The petitioner has raised a very serious question with regard to the construction of road through demarcated protected forest land. Unless clearance is given by the Ministry of Environment & Forests, Government of India, no such road can be constructed. We; therefore, direct the Deputy Commissioner, Kangra at Dharamshala to personally visit the spot and get that area video graphed in his presence and submit his report by the next date of hearing as to who is/are carrying out the construction of the

ATTESTED

Section Officer

High Court of Himachal Pradesh
 Section Officer
 High Court of Himachal Pradesh
 Shimla-191001
 दिनांक- 30/07/2012
 न्यायालय-1965-एचएचसी/2012-31-01-2012-1,00,000.

ATTESTED

Section Officer

High Court of Himachal Pradesh
 Shimla-191001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

26
- 2 -


Date	Order
------	-------


road and whether permission in this behalf has been taken from the competent authority or not.

Till further orders, we direct that no construction shall be carried out through the forest land. The Conservator of Forests, Dharamshala, District Kangra and the Divisional Forest Officer, Dharamshala, District Kangra are made responsible to comply with the order.

List on 3.8.2012.

Authenticated copy.


(Deepak Gupta)
Judge


(Rajiv Sharma)
Judge

July 17, 2012
(Kulpana)

TESTED
Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Order

3

CWP No.5600/2012-1

2012

Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
 Mr. Anup Rattan, Central Government Counsel,
 for respondent No.1.

 Mr. Vivek Thakur, Additional Advocate General
 with Mr. Ramesh Thakur, Assistant Advocate
 General, for respondents No.2 to 4 and 6 to 8.

Petitioner has not taken steps to add necessary parties to the petition. Such steps be positively taken within one week from today. Deputy Commissioner, Kangra was directed to personally visit the spot and submit his report but has not submitted the said report. By the next date, Deputy Commissioner, Kangra shall also submit his report. List on 21st September, 2012. In the meanwhile, the respondents may file reply to the writ petition.

(Deepak Gupta),
 Judge

(Sanjay Karol),
 Judge

August 3, 2012
 k.sharma

ATTESTED

Section Officer
 High Court of Himachal Pradesh
 Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

12
4

Date _____ Order **CWP No. 5600 of 2012.**


21.9.2012. Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. Anup Rattan, Central Govt. Counsel for respondent No.1.
Mr. Vivek Singh Thakur, Addl. A.G. and Mr. Rajesh Mandhotra, Dy. A.G. for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.

CMP No. 11646 of 2012.


Allowed. Amended memo of parties is taken on record.


CWP No. 5600 of 2012.

Fresh notice of the writ petition be now issued to the newly added respondents No. 9 and 10 returnable for 23.11.2012. All the respondents who have not filed the reply may file the reply by the next date.


(Deepak Gupta)
Judge.

21st September, 2012.


(Sanjay Karol)
Judge.


Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

22
5

Date

Order

CWP No. 5600 of 2012

28.11.2012 Present:

Mr. Ajay Sharma Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Anup Rattan, CGSC for respondent No.1.
Mr. Raresh Mandhotra, Dy. A.G. for
respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.
Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No.9.
Mr. Rajinder Singh, Advocate, for respondent
No.10.

Reply has been filed on behalf of respondents
No. 2, 3 4, 6, 7 and 8. The reply has been filed on the
affidavit of Mr. Amitabh Gautam, Conservator of Forests, in
which it is stated as follows:-

"Para-4 That the contents of this para are admitted to the extent that Naddi area is important from tourism point of view and may hotels have been repaired being constructed purely on private lands for tourism purpose. It is vehemently denied that the hoteliers in connivance with forest staff have made road through the demarcated protected forest and for that purpose trees were cut without permission. In fact, no road is being constructed in DPF (Demarcated Protected Forest) and no trees have been cut for the said purpose. It is further submitted that there exists an age old Katcha path in Undemarcated Protected Forest (UPF) which is being used by the inhabitants/community of Mohal Dhayal in Mauza Dharamshala. This path originates from Satobari Bus Stand and terminates at Naddi and was constructed by Gram Panchayat, Bhatalla in the year 2003. (Annexed as Annexure R-3). A portion of this path measuring 166 metres in length falling in Khasra No. 103 was being surface dressed and leveled by Sh. Om Parkash S/O Sh. Roshan Lal and other inhabitants of Mohal Dhayal for which Damage Reprot No.1/741 dated 01.05.2012 (Annexed as Annexure R-4) was issued against Sh. Om Parkash S/o Sh. Roshan Lal. This damage report has been compounded under section 68 of IFA, 1927 and compensation rates approved by C.F. Dharamshala vide his Memo No. C.XII-I/Vol-VI/3749-51 dated 24.07.2010 and subsequent Memo No. C.XII-I/4248-50 dated 09.08.2010 by realizing an amount of Rs.29,830 only

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

23
6

Date

Order

which stands remitted into Govt. Treasury. The rest of the contents of this para are denied, as no tree has either been removed or dried along the portion of the above mentioned kaacha path and no debris or much have been thrown on the trees."

We are shocked to see this reply being filed by Conservator of Forests. From the photographs annexed with the petition, it is more than obvious that the road, which is being constructed, is not a pedestrian path but a full fledged road. How could the villagers or anybody else have constructed this road through the land which is admittedly a forest land without the knowledge of the forest officials? What action the Conservator of Forests has taken against the Forest Guard and the Range Officer concerned? Therefore, Mr. Amitabh Gautam, is directed to personally visit the spot and verify these facts and file a fresh affidavit by the next date before this Court. List the matter on 4th January, 2013.

November 23, 2012
(vt)

(Signature)
(Deepak Gupta),
Judge

(Signature)
(Kuldip Singh),
Judge

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

2
95

Date

Order

4.1.2013

CWP No. 5600 of 2012-J

Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Negi, Advocate vice Mr. Sandeep Sharma, ASGI, for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Virender Verma, Addl. A.G. with Mr. R. S. Verma, Addl. A.G. and Mr. Vikram Thakur, Dy. A.G. for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.

Mr. C. N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9.

Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10.

CMP No. 16337 of 2012

This is an application filed by the Union of India permitting it to withdraw the reply filed by respondent No. 1 on the ground that the reply in fact pertains to another case. This application is allowed and the Registry is directed to return the original reply filed to the learned counsel for the Union of India.

CWP No. 5600 of 2012

We have considered the additional reply filed by the Conservator of Forests, Dharamshala. Parties may file response to the same.

2. At the outset we may notice that even as per this affidavit lot of construction was going on. The affidavit now filed is also similar to the earlier affidavit though some more details have been given. From the new affidavit filed it is apparent that in addition to some villagers allegedly widening and maintaining the path a huge retaining wall of 65 meters

ATTESTED

Section Officer
th Court of ...
Sh...

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Date

Order

8
24

-2- CWP No. 5600 of 2012-J

had also been constructed. We are not at all satisfied with the averment that since some forest official was on leave and another forest official was given dual charge these violations of forest laws could not be found out. The area in question is not a remote area. There are houses and hotels around this entire area. This area is very close to the main Dharamshala - Meclodganj road and is a highly frequented area.

3. By the next date the Conservator of Forests, Dharamshala, should explain to us why action has not been taken against the erring forest official(s). Even now we find in the affidavit that the Conservator of Forests is trying to cover up certain things. We in our last order had specifically noticed that para -4 of the reply was wrong because from the photographs which were annexed with the petition it was more than obvious that the road which was constructed was not a pedestrian path but a full fledged road. We, therefore, direct the Chief Engineer, HPPWD, Dharamshala to personally visit the area and under his supervision he will get the entire road measured and shall depict the width of the road in the affidavit to be filed by the next date.

4. It shall be the responsibility of the Conservator of Forests and other forest officials to ensure that no further construction of the road is permitted unless all approvals are obtained as required under the law and by the next date we

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shankar

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

97
19

Date

Order


-3-


CWP No. 5600 of 2012-J

direct that the Conservator of Forests shall file another affidavit giving the latest status report as to what steps have been taken to undo the damage which has already been caused.

List on 22nd March, 2013. Respondent No. 9 may also file reply by the next date. Name of Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, be also reflected in the cause list.

Copy dasti.


(Deepak Gupta),
Judge.


(Sanjay Karol),
Judge.

January 4, 2013
(PK)

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

28
10

Date	Order
22.03.2013	<p>CWP No. 5600 of 2012.]</p> <p>Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner. Mr. Anup Rattan, Central Government Standing Counsel, for respondent No. 1. Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. M.A. Khan, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Vikram Thakur, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8. Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10. Mr. Shrawan Dogra, learned Advocate General, submits that the affidavit has been filed pursuant to the previous order. The same is not on record. The Registry is directed to place the same on record, if found in order.</p> <p>List next week.</p> <p>(R.B. Misra) Acting Chief Justice</p> <p>(Rajiv Sharma) Judge</p> <p>March 22, 2013 (rajiv)</p> <p>ATTESTED</p> <p>Section Officer High Court of Jammu & Kashmir Shrinagar-171001</p>

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

28

Date

Order

11-

CWP No. 5600 of 2012-J


05.04.2013


Present: Mr. Himmat Negi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with Mr. Anup Rattan, Mr. Romesh Verma, Additional Advocate Generals and Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents No.2 to 4 and 6 to 8.

Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.10.

Rejoinder be filed within two weeks.


(R.B. Misra)
Judge


(Rajiv Sharma)
Judge



5th April, 2013
(kck/Purohit)

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Jharkhand Pradip
Shanidar 001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

92
12/12

Date	Order
3.5.2013:	CWP No. 5600 of 2012-J
	Present: Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate vice counsel, for the petitioner.
	Mr. Anup Ratan, CGSC, for respondent No. 1.
	Mr. Shrawan Dogra, AG with Mr. Romesh Verma, Addl. AG, Mr. J.K. Verma, and Ms. Parul Negi, Dy. AGs for the respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8.
	Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate with Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate for the respondent No. 10.
	Counsel for the petitioner prays for two weeks' time to file rejoinder. That be filed within two weeks, as last opportunity. Stand over till 23rd May, 2013.
	 (A.M. Khanwilkar) Chief Justice.
	 (R.B. Misra), Judge.
3 rd May, 2013 (sl/krs)	
	ATTESTED Section Officer High Court of Himachal Pradesh Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

5)
-13-

Date

Order CWP No. 5600 of 2012-J

23.05.2013

Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, ASGI, for respondent No. 1.
Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with Mr. Anup Rattan, Addl. AG and Mr. J.K. Verma and Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.
Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate for respondent No. 10.

According to the petitioner, two roads, shown in map at Pages-139 and 141, have been constructed at the behest of respondents No. 9 and 10, who would be the beneficiaries as the road ends near the place of construction put up by the said respondents. In other words, the petitioner asserts that the said respondents instigated the villagers to insist for construction of road, referred to in the map at Pages 139 and 141 respectively, to subserve their ulterior design. The fact that respondents No. 9 and 10 have put up construction in and around the said area, is not in serious doubt. The fact remains that it has come on record that around 150 roads have been constructed without obtaining prior permission of the Ministry of Environment & Forest, Government of India, which is the pre-condition for using the land in forest area for non-forest activity. The Ministry of Environment & Forest is already ^{seized} ceased of this issue. In that case, we expect the said Ministry to respond to the course of action, to be adopted against the erring officials as well as the beneficiaries of the illegal and

राजकीय मुद्रणालय, हि० प्र०, शिमला-3743-एच. एच. सी./2011-7-4-2011-1,00,000.

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

14

Date	Order
	<p>unauthorized activity done in forest area. Our attention was invited to F.I.R., registered at the instance of petitioner on 27th July, 2012. However, what is noticed, from the contents of the said F.I.R., is allegation with reference to specific incident and not to the other aspects which may emerge from the record and including the case of criminal conspiracy. All these aspects can be considered on the next date. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awaiting response of the Ministry of Environment & Forest Department, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hearing is deferred till 20th June, 2013.</p>

We make it clear that pendency of this petition is not an impediment for the concerned Authorities to proceed in the matter in accordance with law and also should not influence the criminal case, already registered, at the instance of the petitioner. On the next date of hearing, the State, on affidavit, shall submit status of F.I.R., at Page-49 of the Paper Book, referred to above. Copy dasti.

Sd/-
(A.M.Khanwilkar),
Chief Justice
Sd
(R.B.Misra),
Judge

23rd May, 2013.
(S/S)

ATTESTED
Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET


33
45-

Date Order


CWP No. 5600 of 2012.

20.6.2013. Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Ravinder Thakur, CGC, for respondent No.1.
Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. A.K. Rattan, Mr. Romesh Verma, Addl. Advocate Generals and Mr. J.K. Verma, Dy. Advocate General, for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.
Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.10.

Stand over till 1st July, 2013.


(A.M. Khanwilkar),
Chief Justice.

20th June, 2013.
(karan/tr)


(Kuldip Singh),
Judge.

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

16
CWP No. 5600 of 2012-1

Date	Order
1.07.2013	<p>Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner. Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondent No. 1. Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. Anup Rattan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8. Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9. Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10. List this matter alongwith CWP No. 9797 of 2012 on 17th July,</p>
2013.	<p>(A.M. Khanwilkar) Chief Justice (Kuldip Singh) Judge</p>
July 1, 2013 (rajni/vv)	

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

25
-17

Date

15.7.2013.

Order
CWP No. ~~5600~~ of 2012 & 9797 of 2012.


Present:

Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).


Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma, Addl. AG and Mr. J.K. Verma, DAG, for respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8.

Mr. C.N.Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9.

List these petitions alongwith COPC No. 56 of 2009 on 26.7.2013.


(A.M. Khanwilkar),
Chief Justice.

15th July, 2013.
(karan/tr)




(Kuldip Singh),
Judge.

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh.
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

18

Date	Order
17.7.2013 Present:	CWP No.5600 of 2012 a/w CWP No. 9797 of 2012
	Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner(s). Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma, Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate Generals & Mr. J.K. Verma and Ms. Parul Negi, Dy. Advocate Generals for respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8.
	List on 26th July, 2013 as per order dated 15 th July,
	2013.
	 (A.M. Khanwilkar) Chief Justice
	 (R.B. Misra) Judge
July 17, 2013 (vt/rajni)	
	ATTESTED Section Officer High Court of Himachal Pradesh Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

37
19

Date

Order CWP No. 5600 of 2012 a/w
CWP No. 9797 of 2012 & COPC No. 56 of 2009

26.07.2013

Present: CWP No. 5600 of 2012

Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India,
for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh
Verma, Additional Advocate General, and Mr. J.K. Verma
& Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for
respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8.

Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9.

Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10.

CWP No. 9797 of 2012

Mr. Bipin C. Negi, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India,
for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh
Verma, Additional Advocate General, and Mr. J.K. Verma
& Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for
respondents No. 2 to 6.

Mr. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate, for respondent No. 8.

COPC No. 56 of 2009

None for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India,
for Union of India.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh
Verma, Additional Advocate General, and Mr. J.K. Verma
& Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for
respondents-State.

CWPs No. 5600 & 9797 of 2012

Considering the fact now revealed by the learned
Advocate General across the Bar that it has come to light that in all,
approximately 829 roads have been constructed without taking prior
permission, prior to August 2009, since those roads are already put to
public use and it will not serve public interest by closing those roads
or directing to remove the same, the State Government, in principal, is

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

राजकीय मुद्रणालय, हि० प्र०, शिमला-461-एच० एच० सी० / 2013-3-8-2013--1,00,000.

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

33
20

Date	Order
------	-------

inclined to move a formal proposal to the Ministry of Environment to ratify the action of construction of those roads undertaken by the State Government in good faith on such conditions, as may be permissible in law, including by imposing environmental damage compensatory costs and further direction to put up retention walls in certain areas, which need strengthening and upon compliance of such conditions, a formal ex-post facto sanction can be granted in respect of those roads.

2. We are inclined to accept this submission in public interest, provided such authority vests with the Ministry of Environment in law. If such proposal is moved by the State Government, appropriate decision thereon can be taken within reasonable time and preferably within six weeks from its receipt. The Ministry of Environment will be free to examine the said proposals uninfluenced by the orders passed by this Court in COPC No. 56 of 2009 or any other order passed in the companion proceedings. The decision taken by the Ministry of Environment, however, will be subject to the outcome of the present proceedings and can be given effect to only after the Court so directs.

3. We make it clear that if the State is required to pay compensatory costs, if so ordered by the Ministry of Environment, Government of India, the manner of recovery of such compensatory costs and from persons responsible for the situation can be evolved by the State Government and even that proposal can be submitted to the Court, if so required.

4. To be listed on 8th August, 2013.

ATTESTED

Section Officer

High Court of Himachal Pradesh

राजकीय मुद्रणालय, हि० प्र०, शिमला-461-एच० एच० सी० / 2013-3-8-2013-1,00,000.

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

88
21

Date

Order

-: 3 :-

COPC No. 56 of 2009

Not on Board. Upon mentioning, taken on Board. To be listed on 8th August, 2013, alongwith CWP No. 5600 of 2012.

Copy dasti.

(A.M. Khanwilkar)
Chief Justice

(R.B. Misra)
Judge

July 26, 2013

(mjns / vt)

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

40
322

CWP No. 5600 of 2012 n/w CWP No. 9797 of 2012 & COPC No. 56 of 2009

Date

08.08.2013

Present:

CWP No. 5600 of 2012

Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. Anup Rattan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8.

Mr. Devender Sharma, Advocate, vice Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9.

Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10.

CWP No. 9797 of 2012

Mr. Bipin C. Negi, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. Anup Rattan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 6.

Mr. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate, for respondent No. 8.

COPC No. 56 of 2009

Mr. Ajay Mohan Goel, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for Union of India.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. Anup Rattan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents-State.

We have heard counsel for the parties.

2. The learned Advocate General, on instructions, submits that the State is more than keen to find out solution to the impending problem. The State is not only willing to pay compensatory costs, as may be determined by the Appropriate Authority, but is, on its own, willing to provide more infrastructure and facilities to strengthen the

ATTESTED

Section Officer
Court of Himachal Pradesh,
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

4)
-23-

Date

Order

:- 2 :-

environmental cause in the concerned region. Those logistics can be worked out only after the decision of the Appropriate Authority with regard to the 841 road projects in question.

3. The learned Assistant Solicitor General of India submits that the MoEF, Government of India, has no objection to examine the proposal initiated by the State Government, but the officials of the said Ministry are finding difficulty in working out the final arrangement and, more particularly, because of the directions given by the learned Single Judge of this Court in order, dated 28th August, 2009, in COPC No. 56 of 2009.

4. Keeping in mind this grievance of the respondent-Authorities, we thought it appropriate to direct the Registry to circulate the papers concerning COPC No. 56 of 2009. Although, the order has not been challenged by any Authority or party to the proceedings, in the peculiar facts of the present case, it has become essential to consider whether the direction contained in the said order should be kept in abeyance or otherwise.

5. In our considered opinion, if the direction contained in COPC No. 56 of 2009 is required to be complied by the concerned Authority and, in particular, MoEF, it ^{will} not be possible for the MoEF to work on the ~~recent~~ ^{to be} proposal submitted by the State Government, which, as observed in our previous order, is in larger public interest. The issue regarding action to be taken against the erring officials of the concerned departments and Ministry can always be redressed at the appropriate stage, but consideration of the proposal submitted by

ATTESTED

Section Officer
out of [unclear] Pratis
Srinis

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

24

Date	Order
------	-------

3:-

the State Government cannot and should not brook delay. The issue regarding ratification of the action of the State Government regarding construction of 841 road projects across the State of Himachal Pradesh will have to be resolved in the first place in conformity with the requirement of law, which the State Government as well as the MoEF has ~~also~~ assured the Court to consider the same in right earnest.

6. In these peculiar facts, we are inclined to hold that it is but appropriate that the direction given in COPC No. 56 of 2009, in order dated 28th August, 2009, should be kept in abeyance to enable the concerned departments to take a final decision on the proposal submitted by the State Government.

7. Counsel appearing for the department as well as the State Government have submitted that the Authorities would report about the possibility and feasibility of granting approval or otherwise on the proposal of the State before the next date of hearing, which can be scheduled after three weeks. In the circumstances, hearing of these matters is deferred till 5th September, 2013, to enable the MoEF, Government of India and the State Government to work out a holistic plan for not only restoration of the environment, besides quantifying the compensatory costs to be paid by the State Government. That will have to be in conformity with the provisions of law and uninfluenced by the observations in the order dated 28th August, 2009 in COPC No. 56 of 2009, referred to above.

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

8. The learned Advocate General assures the Court that in

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

43
-25-

Date	Order
	<p>- 4 :-</p> <p>the joint meeting to be held between the officials of the concerned departments and Authorities, broad guidelines will be worked out on the basis of which the plan can be taken forward. We place this submission on record. The joint meeting to be convened on 19th August, 2013, in the office of Conservator of Forests (Central), Government of India, Chandigarh, at 11.00 a.m.</p> <p>Copy dasti.</p> <p>(A.M. Khanwilkar) Chief Justice</p> <p>(Kuldip Singh) Judge</p> <p>August 8, 2013 (rajni / sl)</p> <p>ATTESTED</p> <p>Section Officer High Court of Jammu & Kashmir Srinagar</p>

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Ord. CWP No. 5600 of 2012 a/w CWP No. 9797 of 2012 & COPC No. 56 of 2009

Date

05.09.2013

Present: CWP No. 5600 of 2012
 Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
 Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondent No. 1.
 Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. Anup Rattan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8.
 Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9.
 Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10.

CWP No. 9797 of 2012
 Mr. Bipin C. Negi, Advocate, for the petitioners.
 Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondent No. 1.
 Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. Anup Rattan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 6.
 Mr. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate, for respondent No. 8.

COPC No. 56 of 2009
 None for the petitioner.
 Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for Union of India.
 Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. Anup Rattan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Ms. Parul Negi, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents-State.

Heard counsel for the parties.

2. We have perused the minutes of the proceedings of the joint meeting held on 19th August, 2013, attended by all the concerned duty holders noted in our order dated 8th August, 2013. Since, in principal, agreement has been reached for regularization of 841 roads subject to certain compliances to be made by the State Government and

ATTESTED

Section Officer
 High Court of Himachal Pradesh
 Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

45
27

Date

Order

-: 2 :-

that process is likely to take some time, we have no hesitation in deferring the hearing of this matter for the time being till 30th December, 2013, for reporting of further action taken by the concerned duty holders.

3. Learned Assistant Solicitor General of India submitted that the MoEF is of the opinion that in addition to 841 roads, referred to in the order dated 8th August, 2013, by this Court, it is possible that there are other roads, which are not included in the list of 841 roads. That figure may jump to around 1500. In other words, there are more than 660 roads, which have not been brought to the notice of the MoEF as of today.

4. The learned Advocate General appearing for the State submits that this apprehension will be duly examined at the highest level by the State Government and the information that would be collated during such enquiry, the Principal Secretary (PWD) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh shall submit that information to the MoEF not later than two months from today. The State Government, through learned Advocate General, undertakes to abide by all the conditions specified in the minutes of the joint meeting held on 19th August, 2013, even with regard to the unlisted roads of which information will be furnished by the State Government in due course.

5. In view of this assurance given by the State Government,

ATTEST



we do not deem it necessary to issue any direction on that issue as of

Section Officer,
High Court of Himachal Pradesh,
Shimla-171001.

Learned Assistant Solicitor General of India then invited

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

28

Date	Order
	<p>our attention to Clause (a) of the minutes and pointed out that the State Government be directed to submit the list of officers responsible for violation.</p> <p>7. In our opinion, insistence of this compliance will be counter productive at this stage. In our order, dated 8th August, 2013, we have already kept the order dated 28th August, 2009, in abeyance. Necessity of furnishing list of officers of the State Government responsible for violation would arise only if the said order was to be revived and the abeyance order is recalled.</p> <p>8. In the circumstances, we hope that the officials of MoEF or any other department of the Government of India shall not insist for compliance of furnishing the names, designations and complete addresses of the officers of the State Government responsible for past violations.</p> <p>9. Accordingly, this matter be notified on 30th December, 2013. The arrangement directed in terms of order dated 8th August, 2013, to continue till further directions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Copy dasti.</p> <div style="text-align: right;"> <p> (A.M. Khanwilkar) Chief Justice</p> <p> (Kuldip Singh) Judge</p> </div> <p>September 5, 2013 <i>(rajni / vt)</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Section High Court of Himachal Pradesh Shimla-171001</p>

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Date

Order

CWP No. 5600 of 2012 a/w CWP
No. 9797 of 2012, 7230/2012, &
6809 of 2013.

30.12.2013.Present:

CWP No. 5600/2012.

Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of
India, for respondent No.1.
Mr. Anup Rattan, Mr. Romesh Verma, Additional
Advocates General, with Mr. J.K. Verma, Deputy
Advocate General, for respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8.
Mr. C. N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9.
Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10.

CWP No. 9797/2012.

Mr. B.C. Negi, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of
India, for respondent No.1.
Mr. Anup Rattan, Mr. Romesh Verma, Additional
Advocates General, with Mr. J.K. Verma, Deputy
Advocate General, for respondents No. 2, 3, 4 and 6.
Nemo for respondent No. 5.
Mr. Ranjish Maniktala, Advocate, for respondent No. 8.

CWP No.7230 of 2012.

Mr. Ajay Mohan Goel, Advocate, for the
petitioner.
Mr. Anup Rattan, Mr. Romesh Verma, Additional
Advocates General, with Mr. J.K. Verma, Deputy
Advocate General, for respondents No. 1 to 6.
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of
India, for respondent No.7.

CWP No. 6809/2013.

Mr. B.M. Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of
India, for respondents No.1 and 2.
Mr. Anup Rattan, Mr. Romesh Verma, Additional
Advocates General, with Mr. J.K. Verma, Deputy
Advocate General, for respondents No. 3 to 5.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, learned Assistant Solicitor

General of India stated at the Bar that Himachal Pradesh



Government has made some recommendations which are

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shri. 1/1001

48
30

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Date	Order
	-2-
	<p>under active consideration of respondent No. 1 and sought eight weeks' time to file present status. At this stage, Mr. Anup Rattan, learned Additional Advocate General sought three months' time in order to settle the issue once for all. In the given circumstances, we deem it proper to grant three months' time to the State Government as well as the Central Government to file latest status. List on 2nd April, 2014.</p>
	<p> (Mansoor Ahmad Mir) Acting Chief Justice.</p>
	<p> (Kuldip Singh) Judge.</p>
	<p>December 30, 2013 (cmt/krt)</p>
	<p>ATTESTED Section Officer High Court of Himachal Pradesh Shimla-171001</p>

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Date

Order

CWP No.5600 of 2012 with CWP No.9797 of 2012, CWP No.6809 of 2013 and COPC No.56 of 2009.

02.04.2014

Present:

CWP No.5600 of 2012:

Nemo for the petitioner.

Mr.Sandeep Sharma, ASGI for respondent No.1.
Mr.Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with
Mr.Romesh Verma and Mr.V.S.Chauhan,
Addl.A.Gs., Mr.J.K.Verma and Mr.Kush Sharma,
Dy.A.Gs., for respondents No.2 to 4 & 6 to 8.
Mr.C.N.Singh, Advocate for respondent No.9.
Mr.Arvind Sharma, Advocate for respondent
No.10.

CWP No.9797 of 2012:

Mr.B.C.Negi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr.Sandeep Sharma, ASGI for respondent No.1.
Mr.Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with
Mr.Romesh Verma and Mr.V.S.Chauhan,
Addl.A.Gs., Mr.J.K.Verma and Mr.Kush Sharma,
Dy.A.Gs., for respondents No.2 to 4 & 6.
Mr.Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate for respondent
No.8.

CWP No.6809 of 2013:

Mr.B.M.Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Sandeep Sharma, ASGI for respondents No.1 &
2.
Mr.Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with
Mr.Romesh Verma and Mr.V.S.Chauhan,
Addl.A.Gs., Mr.J.K.Verma and Mr.Kush Sharma,
Dy.A.Gs., for respondents No.3 to 5.

COPC No.56 of 2009:

Mr.Ajay Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.



Mr.B.M.Chauhan, Advocate for the respondent.

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

मला-461-एच० एच० सी०/2013-3-6-2013-1,00,000.

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Date	Order
	<p>Mr.V.S.Chauhan, learned Additional Advocate General, stated at the Bar that compliance report, in terms of orders dated 5th September, 2013 and 6th January, 2014, has been filed in CWP No.9797 of 2012, which be treated as compliance report in all the connected matters. His statement is taken on record. Ordered accordingly.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the petitioners sought and are granted four weeks' time to file response to the said compliance report. In the meantime, respondents - State and Union of India are directed to file fresh status report indicating therein as to what steps they have taken in compliance of orders passed by this Court from time to time and what steps are being proposed to take all the writ petitions to their logical end.</p> <p>List on 4th June, 2014.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">  (Mansoor Ahmad Mir) Acting Chief Justice. </p> <p> 2nd April, 2014. (son/Tick) </p> <p style="text-align: right;">  (Tarlok Singh Chauhan) Judge </p> <p> ATTESTED Section Officer High Court of Himachal Pradesh Shimla-171001 </p>

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET



51 33

Date	Order
04.06.2014	<p>CWP No. 5600 of 2012 a/w CWP No. 9797 of 2012, CWP No. 6809 of 2013 and COPC No. 56 of 2009</p> <p>CWP No. 5600 of 2012</p> <p>Present: Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner. Mr. Pankaj Negi, Advocate vice Mr. Sandeep Sharma, ASGI, for respondent No.1. Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. M.A. Khan, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate General for respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6 to 8. Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No.9. Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.10.</p> <p>CWP No. 9797 of 2012</p> <p>Mr. B.C. Negi, Advocate, for the petitioners. Mr. Pankaj Negi, Advocate vice Mr. Sandeep Sharma, ASGI, for respondent No.1. Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. M.A. Khan, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate General for respondents No. 2 to 4 & 6. Mr. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate, for respondent No.8.</p> <p>CWP No.6809 of 2013</p> <p>Mr. B.M. Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner. Mr. Pankaj Negi, Advocate vice Mr. Sandeep Sharma, ASGI, for respondents No.1 and 2. Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. M.A. Khan, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate General for respondents No. 3 to 5.</p> <p>COPC No. 56 of 2009</p> <p>Mr. Ajay Mohan Goel, Advocate, for the petitioner. Mr. B.M. Chauhan, Advocate, for the respondent.</p> <p>Learned Advocate General stated at the Bar that he has prepared the status report in terms of order dated 2nd April, 2014 and sought one week's time to file the same in the Registry. He further stated that he has directed the Authority concerned to submit the details of the steps taken</p>

ATTESTED

Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

CONTINUED ORDER SHEET

Date	Order
	<p>in compliance of the orders passed from time to time enabling him to file fresh status report. All the Authorities concerned are directed to submit the details of the steps taken in compliance of orders passed by this Court from time to time to the Advocate General, enabling him to prepare and file fresh status report. List on 23rd July, 2014.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> (Mansoor Ahmad Mir) Acting Chief Justice</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> (Tarlok Singh Chauhan) Judge</p> <p>June 4, 2014 ivt</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ATTESTED Section Officer High Court of Jharkhand - Ranchi. Shimla-71(01)</p>

CWP No. 5600 of 2012 a/w CWPs
No. 9797 of 2012, 6809 of 2013
and COPC No. 56 of 2009

23.07.2014

Present:

CWP No. 5600 of 2012

Nemo for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. V.S. Chauhan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.

Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 9.

Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10.

CWP No. 9797 of 2012

Mr. B.C. Negi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. V.S. Chauhan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6.

Mr. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate, for respondent No. 8.

CWP No. 6809 of 2013

Mr. B.M. Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Assistant Solicitor General of India, for respondents No. 1 and 2.

Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh Verma & Mr. V.S. Chauhan, Additional Advocate Generals, and Mr. J.K. Verma & Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate Generals, for respondents No. 3 to 5.

COPC No. 56 of 2009

Mr. Sunil Mohan Goel, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. B.M. Chauhan, Advocate, for the respondent.

Learned Advocate General seeks and is granted four weeks' time to file fresh status report in terms of order, dated 4th June, 2014. List on 3rd September, 2014.

-sd-
(Mansoor Ahmad Mir)
Chief Justice

-sd-
(Tarlok Singh Chauhan)
Judge

July 23, 2014
(rajni)

ATTESTED
Section Officer
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

03.09.2014

CWP No. 5600 of 2012 a/w CWPs
No. 9797 of 2012, 6809 of 2013,
and COPC No. 56 of 2009

Present:

CWP No. 5600 of 2012

Mr. Amit Jamwal, Advocate, vice Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Pankaj Negi, Advocate, vice Mr. Rajiv Jiwan, Senior Panel
Counsel, for respondent No. 1.
Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh
Verma & Mr. V.S. Chauhan, Additional Advocate Generals, and
Mr. J.K. Verma & Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate Generals,
for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6 to 8.
Mr. Devender Kumar, Advocate, vice Mr. C.N. Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No. 9.
Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No. 10.

CWP No. 9797 of 2012

Mr. B.C. Negi, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Pankaj Negi, Advocate, vice Mr. Rajiv Jiwan, Senior Panel
Counsel, for respondent No. 1.
Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh
Verma & Mr. V.S. Chauhan, Additional Advocate Generals, and
Mr. J.K. Verma & Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate Generals,
for respondents No. 2 to 4 and 6.
Mr. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate, for respondent No. 8.

CWP No. 6809 of 2013

Mr. B.M. Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Pankaj Negi, Advocate, vice Mr. Rajiv Jiwan, Senior Panel
Counsel, for respondents No. 1 and 2.
Mr. Shrawan Dogra, Advocate General, with Mr. Romesh
Verma & Mr. V.S. Chauhan, Additional Advocate Generals, and
Mr. J.K. Verma & Mr. Kush Sharma, Deputy Advocate Generals,
for respondents No. 3 to 5.

COPC No. 56 of 2009

Mr. Ajay Mohan Goel, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. B.M. Chauhan, Advocate, for the respondent.

Mr. J.K. Verma, learned Deputy Advocate General, stated that
the Chief Conservator of Forests, Dharamshala, has filed affidavit before the
Registry yesterday. Registry to trace and place the same on record. List on
6th September, 2014.

sd
(Mansoor Ahmad Mir)
Chief Justice

sd
(Tarlok Singh Chauhan)
Judge

September 3, 2014
(rajni)

Section Off
High Court of Himachal Pradesh
Shimla-171001

sd
30/9/2014

- (1) No. of application 2173
- (2) Name of applicant Sh. N. S. Choudhary Adv
- (3) Date of presentation of application 3-4-24
- (4) Probable date of delivery of copy 3-4-24
- (5) Date of requisition of record 2-4-24
- (6) Date of receipt of record 3-4-24
- (7) Copy prepared by Sh. Sandeep
- (8) Copy compared by Sh. Seelaj
- (9) By photostate ye (x)
- (10) Date of preparation 3-4-24
- (11) Date of comparison 3-4-24
- (12) Date of identification
- (13) No. of words 1100
- (14) Copying fee 74.00
- (15) Urgent fee 5.00
- (16) Agency fee Rs. 1.50
- (17) Total Rs. 80.50
- (18) Date of delivery

30/05/24

Certified to be true copy

SECTION OFFICER (Judicial)
 COURT OF HIMALACHAL PRADESH
 Section 76 of
 Indian Executive Act 1872

09/05/24