



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

शनिवार, 04 अक्टूबर, 2025 / 12 आश्विन, 1947

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 26th September, 2025

No. LEP-E/1/2024.—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards

144—राजपत्र / 2025—04—10—2025 (6381)

of the following cases announced by the **Presiding Judge, Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, H.P.** on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh *i.e.* “e-Gazette”:—

Sl. No.	Ref. No.	Petitioner	Respondent	Date of Award/Order
1.	70/20	Rajeev Goswami	M/s Jagran Prakashan Ltd.	29-03-2025

By order,

PRIYANKA BASU INGTY, IAS,
Secretary (Lab. Emp. & O.P.).

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE,
LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA
(HP)**

Reference No. : 70/2020

Date of Institution : 09.9.2020

Date of Decision : 29.03.2025

Shri Rajiv Goswami s/o Shri Des Raj Goswami, r/o Village Suked, P.O. Nalsuha, Tehsil Dehra, District Kangra, H.P.
Petitioner.

Versus

1. The Managing Director, M/S Jagran Prakashan- Jagran Building, Sarvodyanagar, Kanpur, UP.

2. The CEO, M/s Jagran Prakashan Limited, Plot No.10, Sector-63, Noida, UP.

3. The Chief General Manager, M/s Jagran Prakashan Limited, SCO 42-43, Sector-8C, Chandigarh.

4. The General Manager, M/S Jagran Prakashan Limited, Banoi, P.O. Banoi, Tehsil Shahpur, District Kangra, H.P.
Respondents.

Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Sh. Ravinder Aggarwal, Ld. AR

For Respondent(s) : Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR
Sh. Vijay Kaundal, Ld. Adv.

AWARD

The following industrial disputes has been received by this court for the purpose of adjudication from the appropriate authority/Deputy Labour Commissioner.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Rajiv Goswami s/o Shri Des Raj Goswami, r/o Village Suket, P.O. Nalsuha, Tehsil Dehra, District Kangra, H.P. w.e.f. 03-10-2015 by (i) the Managing Director, M/S Jagran Prakashan, Jagran Building, Sarvodyanagar, Kanpur, UP (ii) the CEO, M/s Jagran Prakashan, Plot No.10, Sector 63, Noida, U.P. (iii) the Chief General Manager, M/s Jagran Prakashan Limited, SCO 42-43, Sector 8C, Chandigarh (iv) the General Manager M/S Jagran Prakashan Limited, Banoi, P.O. Banoi, Tehsil Shahpur, District Kangra, H.P., without following the provisions of the Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955 and the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employers/management?”

2. Brief facts as stated in the claim are that claimant/petitioner was employed by management of Jagran Prakashan Ltd. as Sub Editor vide appointment letter dated 15.9.2005 and he was deputed the work of publication/printing centre at C-120 Focal Point Extension Jalandhar, Punjab. Thereafter his services were transferred on 5.10.2005 from Jalandhar to Publication/printing centre Dharamshala at Village Banoi, District Kangra, H.P. His services were confirmed *vide* a separate letter dated 1.11.2006 he was promoted as senior sub editor *w.e.f.* 1.2.2010 and further promoted as Chief Sub Editor *w.e.f.* 1.4.2014. He had put in 11 years of services without any chance of complaint from the management. According to petitioner his service condition and wages are governed by Working Journalist and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955 i.e. Governing Act as well as Industrial Employment Standing Orders Act, 1946 and Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is mentioned that the respondent management falls within the definition of Single Newspaper Establishment in terms of Section 2(d) of the Schedule of Governing Act. The respondent management also falls under Chapter VB of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 having more than 100 employees worked per day in the establishment and Factories Act, 1948. The Ministry of Labour had constituted one Board in terms of Section 9 and 13B of Governing Act in order to review and determine the wage and service condition of newspaper employees also approved payment of interim increase of 30% of basic pay to all the newspaper employees from 8th January, 2008 till the revised pay structure came in force on 11.11.2011. No such due amount had been paid by the management in case of claimant/petitioner. Wage Board submitted its recommendations on 31st December, 2010 vide notification dated 11.11.2011 the award was made enforceable. The Hon’ble Supreme Court vide its judgment in ABP Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors. AIR 2014 SC 1228 dismissed the objections and petition against Majithia Wage Board and its recommendations and the Newspaper Establishment were directed to implement the same *w.e.f.* 11.11.2011. It was also directed that arrears be paid upto March, 2014. It is alleged that respondent management did not implement recommendations of Majithia Wage Board and did not revise wage and interim relief of the employees who were continuously demanding the revised wages and service conditions. The employees including the claimant/petitioner had filed a contempt before Hon’ble Supreme Court wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court directed the Chief Secretaries of all the States to appoint Inspectors under Section 17B of the Governing Act to determine the dues and entitlement of category of the newspaper employees and journalists. The Labour Commissioner of HP had submitted its report before Hon’ble Supreme Court and in this compliance affidavit it was mentioned that newspaper employees were being harassed by the management when they were demanding the revised wages and due arrears. It was also mentioned in the affidavit furnished by Labour Commissioner of H.P. before Hon’ble Supreme Court regarding complaint of Shri Rajiv

Goswami s/o Des Raj who worked as Chief Sub Editor in Jagran Prakashan Ltd. regarding harassment of employees on account of demanding wages as per recommendations of Majithia Wage Board. The present claimant and other workmen of respondent management filed an application before Labour Officer Dharamshala for non implementation of the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court. The management started victimization of the claimants/workmen including the petitioner when they demanded their legitimate dues. Management levelled charges against the petitioner alleging that he was supporting so called workers strike on 2.10.2015 however on the said date he was out of station. Due to the filing of application dated 5.5.2015 the management was annoyed and angry with the petitioner and pressurized the workmen to withdraw the application. When workers refused to withdraw, the respondents entered into a conspiracy to terminate the services of the claimant/petitioner on the basis of false and fabricated allegations. The claimant/petitioner along-with other co-workers had intimated the labour authorities about the apprehension of the coercive conduct of the respondent management. On 14.7.2015 the employees of Banoi Office constituted a six members committee and presented a demand notice about their problems and grievances. After filing the demand notice respondent/management was annoyed further and Labour Officer had issued letter dated 23.2.2015 to direct the Labour Inspector Dharamshala to take action as per labour laws. Due to the above developments the petitioner was under mental stress and he was forced to go on leave on 29.9.2015, 30.9.2015 this leave was sanctioned by the Editorial Incharge Shri Navneet Sharma. The petitioner/claimant had further applied for extension of his leave till 2.10.2015 through e-mail on 30.9.2015. This application was deliberately rejected and respondent management levelled the allegations of strike on 2.10.2015 on the other co-workers and suspended them after 3.10.2015. It was wrongly alleged that petitioner was supporting the so called strike. The petitioner/claimant was continuously agitating against the non payment of arrears in terms of Majithia Wage Board recommendations however there was illegal action on the part of the management to restrain him from joining his duty. The management did not allow him to join his duty without any legal and valid reason and verbally terminated him. According to petitioner he never abandoned, absconded from his job rather management had illegally and forcefully restrained him from joining his duty without any notice but for the reasons mentioned above. Claimant/petitioner continuously attended personally and through his representative the conciliation proceedings before Labour Inspector Dharamshala and also before Labour Court Dharamshala in Reference No.714/2016 which was withdrawn on 23.9.2019 with a liberty to file afresh before appropriate authority. Till date the respondent management did not allow the petitioner to join his duties. The applicant/ came to know about his illegal termination during conciliation proceedings before the Labour Inspector-cum-Conciliation Officer, Dharamshala he had given a separate demand to the respondent management regarding allowing him to join his duty. The management did not respond to this letter thereafter applicant filed a complaint application before Labour Commissioner, H.P. on 15.9.2016. Labour Commissioner gave directions to investigate the matter to the office of Labour Office Dharamshala. It is alleged that prima facie the act of respondent was victimization of workman demanding his unpaid dues as per the directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court which was specifically prohibited under Section 16-A of the Governing Act. It is alleged that the conduct of respondent management was violative of principle of natural justice and infringed the provisions of Employment Standing Orders 1946. It is again reiterated by claimant that other employees were not being paid their dues and wages in accordance with the Wage Board notification and the management was disobeying the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court. It is prayed that the act of the management terminating the services of petitioner be held to be illegal unjust and void. Petitioner may be reinstated in service from the day from he was ousted from service along-with full back wages, seniority and other consequential/past service benefits. It is also prayed that petitioner be held entitled for compensation on account of act of victimization by the respondents.

3. A joint reply was filed on behalf of the respondents whereby preliminary objections qua maintainability, abuse of process of law, claimant not falling under definition of 'workman'

under the Industrial Disputes Act, locus standi, resjudicata and wilful abandonment of service by the petitioner have been raised. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioner was appointed and promoted by the respondents. It is however emphasized that claimant/petitioner did not fall under the definition of workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and does not fall under the definition of employee within the meaning of Section 2(f) of the Governing Act of 1955 as he was promoted as Chief Sub Editor and was enjoying supervisory and managerial powers attached to this office. It is further mentioned that contents of the petition regarding the Majithia Wage Board compliance do not have any relevancy in the light of the reference which is referred for adjudication to this court. Moreover, regarding Majithia Wage Board now the petitioner had filed separate claim petition which is pending for adjudication i.e. reference no.7/2020. Earlier claimant/petitioner has withdrawn reference no. 714/2016 wherein also the issue of Majithia Wage Board claim had been referred for adjudication to this court. Respondents denied that there was any sort of harassment as petitioner himself was absconding from his services. The petitioner had started illegal strike with other co-workers which was reason behind his absence and unauthorized leave. The respondents have denied that they conspired to terminate the services of the petitioner and other co-workers. Leave for two days i.e. for 29.9.2015 and 20.9.2015 was allowed to the claimant but thereafter he went on unauthorized leave which clearly amounts to abandonment on his own part. In these circumstances the question of termination of services of claimant/petitioner does not arise. The services of other co-workers were terminated/dismissed after holding fair and proper inquiry. The notices for unauthorized absenteeism dated 10.11.2015, 20.11.2015 and 12.12.2015 were sent to the petitioner asking him to report for duties however he did not attend his duties and also did not give any reply of the notices. As per para 13 of appointment letter (temporary/probation) dated 15.9.2015 as well as the appointment letter (permanent) the claimant/petitioner lost his lien of employment with the respondents. It is further submitted that claimant/petitioner had adopted the option of para 20(J) of the Majithia Wage Board recommendations to retain his existing wages and existing emoluments. He was paid all the wages in terms of undertaking given in the said para and nothing remained as payable. It is reiterated that the facts regarding non implementation of Majithia Wage Board compliance has no relevancy in the present dispute. Other averments and allegations made in the claim petition were denied and it is prayed that the claim deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder preliminary objections have been denied by the petitioner. It is denied that claimant was working in managerial and supervisory capacity. It is also submitted that the services of claimant/petitioner are governed by special statute and revised fixed terms of Section 8 to 13 (AA) of the Governing Act. Other averments made in the petition were reasserted and reaffirmed. It is prayed that the claim deserves to be allowed in the interest of justice.

5. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:—

1. Whether the termination of services of the petitioner w.e.f. 03-10-2015 by the respondents in violation of the provisions of the Working Journalist and Other Newspaper Employees (conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955 and the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified, as alleged? . . .*OPP.*
2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief, the petitioner is entitled to? . . .*OPP.*
3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable, as alleged? . . .*OPR.*

4. Whether the petitioner has not come to this Court with clean hand and has mislead this Court, as alleged. If so, its effect? . . .*OPR.*
5. Whether the claimant is proved as a workman under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 or not. If so, its effect? . . .*OPR.*
6. Whether the petitioner had himself abandoned the services of the respondents in the manner, as alleged? . . .*OPR.*
7. Whether the petitioner has not raised demand notice under Section 2-K of the I.D. Act, 1947 before the Conciliation Officer, Kangra at Dharamshala regarding abandonment the services *w.e.f.* 01.10.2015, as alleged? . . .*OPR.*
8. Whether the petitioner had raised the earlier demand notice in the similar cause of action termination of his service *w.e.f.* Feb. 2016, as alleged? . . .*OPR.*

Relief.

6. In order to prove the case of the examined Shri R.K. Sharma, Labour Officer, Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P. as PW1 who has stated on oath that he brought the requisitioned record he saw the demand notice dated 4.11.2019 Ext. PW1/A. He called for the reply of this demand notice. The conciliation proceedings took place on the basis of this demand but could not be finalized. On failure conciliation report under Section 12(4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was submitted to the appropriate Government. The complaint regarding non implement of Majithia Wage Board was also received by his office. Copy of complaint Ext. PW1/B. PW2 Shri Naresh Kumar, Labour Inspector, Dharamshala has stated on oath that he brought the requisitioned file the conciliation proceedings had taken place in the matter. A complaint dated 5.5.2015 and the failure of conciliation proceeding was sent to appropriate Government on 13.10.2015. There was no document for seeking permission filed by the company during the conciliation proceedings to terminate the services of the petitioner. There was another demand notice filed by petitioner and other employees in which conciliation proceedings were taken place and the demand notice dated 14.7.2015 was supplied by his office under RTI as Ext. PW2/A. The report under Section 12 (4) of the Industrial Disputes Act dated 23.12.2015 supplied under RTI Ext. PW2/B. The notices issued to the parties Ext. PW2/C and Ext. PW2/D and conciliation proceedings dated 24.9.2015 Ext. PW2/E, copy of notice dated 5.10.2015 Ext. PW2/F, conciliation proceedings dated 28.10.2015 Ext. PW2/H and dated 6.10.2015 Ext. PW2/J. The application by the respondent dated 28.10.2015 Ext. PW2/K. During conciliation proceedings joint demand dated 10th August, 2016 was made by petitioner Shri Rajiv Goswami vide letter Ext. PW2/L. Notice dated 7.10.2015 Ext. PW2/M. He further states that no permission was obtained from Conciliation Officer for termination of the services of petitioner. Petitioner Shri Rajiv Goswami produced his affidavit Ext. PW3/A wherein he has reiterated the facts described in the claim petition. He also produced on record appointment letter Ext. PW3/B, appointment letter (permanent) Ext. PW3/C, wage slips Ext. PW3/D, compliance affidavit of Labour Commissioner before Hon'ble Supreme Court Ext. PW3/E, application dated 14.8.2015 Ext. PW3/F, application to General Manager, Dainik Jagran dated 14.7.2015 Ext. PW3/G, letter by Labour Officer to Labour Inspector Dharamshala dated 23.7.2015 Ext. PW3/F, letter to Labour Commissioner dated 15.9.2015 Ext. PW3/J, letter of Labour Commissioner to Labour Officer Dharamshala dated 20.9.2016 Ext. PW3/K, failure report under Section 12(4) dated 23.12.2015 Ext. PW3/L, report under Section 17(2) Ext. PW3/M, copies of appreciation letters Ext. PW3/N1 to Ext. PW3/N8, PF statement of the petitioner Ext. PW3/O, certificate under Section 65(B) Ext. PW3/P, copy of e-mail by petitioner regarding granting leave Ext. PW3/Q and e-mail copy of petitioner to apply for job Ext. PW3/R.

7. Respondents in order to prove their case have examined Mahesh Chandra Mishra s/o Shri R.P. Mishra, Manager Administration Department of Newspaper establishment of M/s Jagran Prakashan Ltd. Banoi by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A. He has stated the case of the respondents on oath in the similar manner as averred in the reply. He also produced on record the following documents on record i.e. authorization letter Ext. RW1/B, resolution Ext. RW1/C, declaration under Section 4 of Press Registration of Book Act Ext. RW1/D, conciliation proceedings dated 16.6.2016 Ext. RW1/E, another conciliation proceedings dated 22.6.2016 Ext. RW1/F, Award dated 23.9.2019 Ext. RW1/G, statement dated 11.12.2017 Ext. RW1/H, reference dated July 2016 Ext. RW1/J, another reference dated September 2016 Ext. RW1/K, Reference dated July, 2016 Ext. RW1/L, notices dated 10.11.2015, 10.11.2015, 20.11.2015, 2-01.12.2015, 12.12.2015, 12.12.2015, Ext. RW1/M to Ext. RW1/R. RW2 Shri Randeep Singh, AGM (Administration), M/s Jagran Prakashan Limited who has tendered in evidence the copies of e-mail dated 4th June, 2015 and 16th September, 2015 Ext. RW2/A and Ext. RW2/B.

8. I have heard the learned Authorized Representative for the petitioner as well as learned AR/Counsel for the respondents at length and records perused.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

Issue No.1	: Partly Yes
Issue No.2	: Decided accordingly
Issue No.3	: No
Issue No.4	: No
Issue No.5	: Yes
Issue No.6	: No
Issue No.7	: No
Issue No.8	: No
Relief.	: Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No.1

10. Reference before this court made by appropriate authority is regarding legality of the termination of services of Shri Rajiv Goswami (petitioner) by the respondents in terms of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Governing Act. Petitioner has claimed that he was employed by the management of respondents as Sub Editor on 15.9.2005 and was promoted as chief Sub Editor w.e.f. 1.4.2014 which implies that he rendered 11 years continuous services with the respondents.

11. The primary contention of the respondents is that considering designation of petitioner and the monthly remuneration received by him, he does not fall within the definition of workman under Section 2 Clause (f) of Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955 i.e. governing act and Section 2 Clause (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is argued that the petitioner's salary was Rs.25715/- per month at the time of his absence from work. The fact regarding the salary is admitted by the petitioner in his cross-examination. Learned Counsel/AR for the respondents has emphasized the findings of Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad in **2005 LLR 251** wherein it was held that "*for determining as to whether an employee is workman or not under the Industrial Disputes Act by the court, wages earned by him and the nature of duties and the work performed*

will be the main factors". It is contended by respondent that the petitioner was not only performing the duties of news editor but also supervising the workers of his subordinates. According to respondents the petitioner was holding the post of Chief Sub Editor which is defined under the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board in Schedule 4 (b) in group as follows:—

Chief Sub-Editor or Content Chief means a person who takes charge of a shift of the news desk, allocates and supervises the work of one or more sub-editors and is generally responsible for the determination of news space and the general display of news in the newspaper or in a particular edition or part of it".

12. Thus it has emphasized that the reference is not maintainable as the petitioner is not a workman under relevant law.

13. On the contrary the learned AR for the petitioner has vehemently argued that though the petitioner was promoted as chief sub editor the primary function of petitioner was editing and in addition to it he was performing other functions also. The wages payable to a working journalist are governed by the provisions of Section 9 to Section 13 (AA) of the Governing Act. Thus the mere criteria of income mentioned in Industrial Disputes Act would not limit the definition of Working Journalists who claim relief under the Governing Act as well as Industrial Disputes Act. The learned AR has laid reliance upon the ratio of judgment laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Management of Rashtradoot, Jaipur vs. Rajasthan Working Journalist Union, Jaipur & Ors., 1970 (20) FLR 1**, paras 11, 12 and 13 as follows:

11. Now it is in this state of evidence that the labour court arrived at the conclusion that Dinesh Khare is a working journalist. It was, however, argued on behalf of the appellant that Dinesh Khare does not fall within the definition of working journalist contained in [Section 2\(f\)](#) of the Act. This sub-mission is difficult to accept. "Working Journalist," according to this definition, means.

a person whose principal avocation is that of a Journalist and who is employed as such in, or in relation to, any newspaper establishment, and includes an editor, a leader-writer, news editor, subeditor, feature-writer, copy-taster, reporter, correspondent, cartoonist, news-photographer and proofreader, but does not include any such person who

(i) is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity, or (ii) being employed in a supervisory capacity, performs, either by the nature of the duties attached to his office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature.

12. An editor is expressly included in this definition. The appellant's counsel attempted to show that though described as an editor, Dinesh Khare had been employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity and that he had also been performing the functions mainly of a managerial character. We may, in this connexion, usefully turn to the written (statement filed by the appellant in the labour court.

13. We find that in Para. 2 it was pleaded as follows:

The contents of Para. 2 do not portray true facts. Dinesh Khare was not only working as an editor, but was also employed in a supervisory capacity and performed, during his tenure by reason of the powers vested In him, functions mainly of managerial nature. The nature of the post held by Khare as well as the functions ho has been discharging are given in additional grounds. Since Dinesh Khare is not a working

Journalist in terms of Sub-clause (11) of Clause (f) of Section 2 of the Working Journalists (Conditions of Service and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1964, the reference made by the Government is incompetent and this tribunal has, therefore, no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon it.

14. The additional grounds pleaded there in may also be reproduced:

Dinesh Khare is an appointing and dismissing authority of the editorial staff of Rashtradoot. He also sanctions leave of the staff of the editorial side. He is also the disciplinary authority under the standing orders, as applicable to Rashtradoot. No working hours are fixed for him and he is not required to sign attendance register as others do. Dinesh Khare also decides and fixes the duty chart of all the editorial staff under him. Increments in the wages of editorial staff are given on his recommendations. These and other similar factors go to show that Dinesh Khare has been vested, since appointment as an editor in 1962, with powers and functions of a managerial nature, and he is, as such, not a working journalist.

15. It was not denied that Khare had been working as an editor. The other functions imputed to him were in addition to his functions as an editor. The question arises, if on this state of the pleadings and evidence as discussed earlier, it can be said that the conclusions of the labour court are either perverse or based on no evidence or are otherwise tainted with such a serious legal infirmity that they should be reopened by us under Article 136 of the Constitution. We are unable to hold that they are. There is legal evidence on the record both oral and documentary, on which the labour court could lawfully base its conclusion. We find no justification for interfering with it”.

14. In accordance with Section 2 Clause (f) part (1) of Governing Act to constitute working journalist he should not be employed mainly in managerial and administrative capacity. The chief sub editor has the primary function of editing as his designation suggests he is an editor. Even though he has been assigned supervision work the sub editor's nature of duties is not the managerial work. In addition to this RW1 Shri Mahesh Chandra has admitted in his cross-examination *“it is correct that recommendations of Majithia Wage Board are applicable to the employees of respondent. It is incorrect that respondent has not paid the salary to the petitioner as per the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board. It is incorrect that no interim relief was paid to the petitioner as per the notification dated 24.10.2008. It is correct that case regarding recovery of wages under Majithia Wage Board is pending adjudication in this court between the petitioner and the respondent. I do not know that existing emoluments were paid to the petitioner as per some settlement having taken place in the year 1992 at Noida. It is correct that the respondent has to maintain record its workers as per provisions 17A of Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Condition of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955. It is correct that petitioner was working in Editorial Department and used to report Shri Navneet Sharma the then news editor. It is correct that Shri Navneet Sharma was not the appointing authority of the workers of the establishment Banoi nor he is the appointing authority today. I do not know that petitioner had no right to mark his presence and approve the leaves of his junior. It is correct that petitioner had no powers to conduct domestic inquiry of any worker junior to him. It is incorrect that petitioner was supposed to do news editing and composing the same on the paper. Self stated petitioner was in the work of performing the work of final authority in respect to the news item. I do not know that no written orders were given to the petitioner to perform supervisory functions. It is correct that I have not placed any such document on record. It is correct that on 5.5.2015 the petitioner along-with other workers had made a complaint regarding non payment of wages as per Majithia Wage Board. It is also correct that the petitioner has submitted demand notice on 14.7.2015 along-with six associates. It is correct that conciliation has taken place on these demand*

letters. It is correct that I used to participate in these proceedings along-with General Manager Shri Randeep Singh. It is also correct that petitioner also used to participate in these proceedings. I do not know that Section 14 of Working Journalist and Other Newspaper Employees (Condition of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955 makes it mandatory to certify the standing orders for the establishment. It is correct that petitioner has started his work in the printing press at Banoi in the year 2005”.

15. The above statement shows that the respondent has conceded that the case of petitioner would fall under the Governing Act and thus the plea of respondents regarding the maintainability of the claim petition appear to be baseless.

16. The illegal termination of petitioner is under challenge in this case. There are specific pleadings as well as oral and documentary evidence with regard to the non implementation of Majithia Wage Board recommendations. The reference which has been produced before this court for the purpose of adjudication however is not with regard to determination of the rights of petitioner and his demand for salary and wages in consequence of Majithia Wage Board recommendations and its applications. Thus this court would confine its findings with respect to alleged illegal termination of the petitioner. It is not disputed that petitioner was appointed on probation basis on 15.9.2005 and was promoted on the post of Chief Sub Editor during this engagement in the year 2015. It is submitted by respondent that petitioner has not pleaded having completed 240 days of continuous work in last 12 months of his employment. In circumstance of this case this fact is however not in dispute or contested between the parties. The fact that the petitioner was in a continuous employment with the respondents, he was even appreciated and promoted during his service is not disputed. There is no doubt that the onus of proving the continuous employment is on the petitioner however since such fact is not in dispute between the parties and parties are not at issue qua this fact it need not be determined by way of evidence. This court would proceed to consider that petitioner had completed 240 days of continuous service in 12 months preceding the date of his disengagement.

17. Petitioner has deposed that on 14.7.2015 the employees of respondent management constituted a six members committee and presented a demand notice about their grievances and problems. This fact is established from the document which has been proved by the witnesses from the Labour Department. Petitioner further alleges that he was harassed and due to depression he was forced to go on leave on 29.9.2015 and 30.9.2015. This leave was sanctioned by Editor Incharge Shri Navneet Sharma. Petitioner further applied for extension of his leave till 2.10.2015 through e-mail on 30.9.2015, this leave was however rejected and management suspended other co-workers on or after 3.10.2015 who were demanding wages and arrears in accordance with Majithia Wage Board award. The petitioner further alleges that he never received the notice dated 2.10.2015, 20.11.2015 and 12.12.2015. He was not allowed by the management to resume his duties as he never abandoned his job. RW1 has further submitted that the petitioner remained absent after 30.10.2015 without information and authorized leave. Petitioner was merely granted leave upto 30.10.2015. He applied for leave further and Editor's mail dated 10.10.2015, 17.10.2015 were conveyed not granting leave to the petitioner. Notices were thereafter sent on last known address of the petitioner however it is admitted in cross-examination by RW1. *“It is correct that standing orders of the establishment have not been certified till date. Our establishment follows model standing orders. It is correct that petitioner has applied for leave w.e.f. 29.9.2015 to 2.10.2015 through e-mail. E-mail address incharge Shri Navneet Sharma. Self stated copies were also forwarded to me. Shri Navneet Sharma has sanctioned the leave for two days and directed the petitioner to report for duty on 1.10.2015. It is correct that Ext. PW1/A is reply submitted by us to labour department during conciliation proceedings. It is correct that there is no mention regarding absence of the petitioner in the documents Ext. PW2/A. It is correct that as many as 17 workers were terminated after holding domestic inquiry w.e.f. 22.2.2016 and 25.2.2016. It is correct that*

petitioner was not charge-sheeted for his wilful absence from duty. It is also correct that no domestic inquiry was conducted against the petitioner. It is incorrect that no notice was served upon the petitioner asking him to join his duty. Self stated that we have issued three letters to him. It is correct that the notices were not served upon the petitioner. Self stated that we have issued the letters on the address given by the petitioner but these letters Ext. RW1/M to Ext. RW1/R were received back by us undelivered. I do not remember that these notices were not sent to the petitioner through e-mail. No such notices were published in our newspaper”.

18. Learned AR/Counsel for the respondents has laid reliance upon the ratio laid down by the Hon’ble High Court of H.P. in **Nagar Parishad Bilaspur vs. Bone Ram & Ors. , 2005 LLR 747** has held in paras 7 and 8 as follows:—

“7. Expression “voluntary retrenchment” in clause (a) of Section 2(oo) of the Act would include abandonment of job by an employee. In common law, an inference can be drawn from the length of absence of an employee from duty and surrounding circumstances that an employee has relinquished his job. It is true that the length of time for which employ abstains, to conclude abandonment, may vary with facts and circumstances of each case. That is why the Standing Orders of Industrial Establishment normally provide that the absence of an employee for certain number of days would be deemed as “abandonment of employment” unless such absence is otherwise explained by the employee.

8. Voluntary retirement of the workman would not retrenchment within the meaning of section 2(oo) of the Act. The contract of service indeed comes to an end when the workman abandons his job. Even though “abandonment of service” is not defined in the Act, yet abandonment “would mean to leave completely and finally” or in other words, voluntarily relinquish the office. The presumption of abandoning the job by an employee can be raised on account of his long absence from duty without leave or permission. However, it is always open to the workman to contend and prove, by satisfactory evidence, that in fact he was not absent or explain in reasons for his absence from work. It is admitted position that workman was absent from duties and with effect from April 1, 1995 without leave and permission. He did not make any representation to any Authority that he is not being permitted to do the work after his hospitalisation”.

19. The learned counsel/AR for the respondents has also relied upon the ratio laid down by Hon’ble Supreme court in **Syndicate Bank vs. General Secretary, Syndicate Bank Staff Association & Anr., 2000 LLR 689** has held in paras 17 and 18 as follows:—

“17.It is no point laying stress on the principles of natural justice without understanding their scope or real meaning. There are two essential elements of natural justice which are : (a) no man shall be judge in his own cause; and (b) no man shall be condemned, either civilly or criminally, without being afforded an opportunity of being heard in answer to the charge made against him. In course of time by various judicial pronouncements these two principles of natural justice have been expanded, e.g., a party must have due notice when the Tribunal will proceed; Tribunal should not act on irrelevant evidence or shut out relevant evidence; if the Tribunal consists of several members they all must sit together at all times; Tribunal should act independently and should not be biased against any party; its action should be based on good faith and order and should act in just, fair and reasonable manner. These in fact are the extensions or refinements of the main principles of natural justice stated above.

18. Bank has followed the requirements of Clause 16 of the Bipartite Settlement. It rightly held that Dayananda had voluntarily retired from the service of the Bank. Under

these circumstances it was not necessary for the Bank to hold any inquiry before passing the order. An inquiry would have been necessary if Dayananda had submitted his explanation which was not acceptable to the Bank or contended that he did report for duty but was not allowed to join by the Bank. Nothing of the like has happened here. Assuming for a moment that inquiry was necessitated, evidence led before the Tribunal clearly showed that notice was given to Dayananda and it is he who defaulted and offered no explanation of his absence from duty and did not report for duty within 30 days the notice as required in Clause 16 of the Bipartite Settlement”.

20. It has argued by the learned AR/Counsel for the respondent that since the petitioner had not replied to the notices issued by the respondents this amounted abandonment of service as the notice has been issued on the last known address of the petitioner. Learned AR for the petitioner has however referred to the findings of Hon’ble High Court of H.P. in **State of H.P. vs. Prakash Chand in CWP No.2565 of 2024 decided on 26.3.2024** has held in paras no.15 and 16 as follows:—

“15. Similarly, this Court finds that plea of abandonment raised by the petitioner-Department never came to be proved on record in accordance with law. Needless to say, onus, if any, to prove abandonment was upon the petitioner-Department, but same never came to be discharged. Since respondent-workman immediately after his being orally terminated, approached erstwhile H.P. Administrative Tribunal by way of Original Application No.290 of 2003, it is hard to believe that he had abandoned the job. Had respondent-workman abandoned the job, where was the occasion for him to approach erstwhile H.P. Administrative Tribunal, wherein admittedly interim order came to be issued to the petitioner-Department to reengage him. Very factum of filing of O.A. after his being disengaged, clearly establishes that at no point of time, respondent-workman abandoned the job, rather his services were illegally terminated by the petitioner-Department without following due procedure of law as prescribed under Section 25-B, 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the Act.

16. It is settled law that mere plea of abandonment, if any, taken by the employer may not be sufficient to prove that workman abandoned the job, rather it is incumbent upon the employer to place on record substantial evidence to prove that specific notice was issued to the workman before alleged abandonment advising/asking workman to join duty within stipulated period. In this regard, reliance is placed upon the judgment passed by Bombay High Court in case titled Ocean Creations Vs. Manohar Gangaram Kamble 2013 SCC Online Bom 1537:2014)140 FLR 725. It is profitable to reproduce paras No.8,9 and 10 of the judgment herein:—

"8. The legal position is also settled that .

'abandonment or relinquishment of service' is always a question of intention and normally such intention cannot be attributed to an employee without adequate evidence in that behalf. This is a question of fact which is to be determined in the light of surrounding circumstances of each case. It is well settled that even in case of abandonment of service, unless the service conditions make special provisions to the contrary, employer has to give notice to the workman calling upon him to resume duties and where he fails to resume duties, to hold an enquiry before terminating services on such ground.

9. In somewhat similar circumstances a Division Bench of this court comprising P.B.Sawant, J.(as he then was) and V.V.Vaze, J. in the case of Gaurishanker Vishwakarma v. Engle Spring Industries Pvt. Ltd.

Observed thus:

".....it is now well settled that even in the case of the abandonment of service, the employer has to give a notice to the workman calling upon him to resume his duty and also to hold an enquiry before terminating his service on that ground. In the present case the employer has done neither. It was for the employer to prove that the workman had abandoned the service..... It is therefore difficult to believe that the workman who had worked continuously for six to seven years, would abandon his service for no rhyme or reason. It has also to be remembered that it was the workman who had approached the Government Labour Officer with a specific grievance that he was not allowed to join his duty. It was also his grievance that although he had approached the company for work from time to time, and the company's partner Anand had kept on promising him that he would be taken in service, he was not given work and hence he was forced to approach the Government Labour Officer. In the circumstances, it is difficult to believe that he would refuse the offer of work when it was given to him before the Labour Officer...."

10. Again a learned Single Judge of this court R.M.Lodha, J(as he then was) in the case of Mahamadsha Ganishah Patel v. Mastanbaug Consumers' Co-op. Wholesale & Retail Stores Ltd. Observed thus:—

"....The legal position is almost settled that even in the case of abandonment of service, the employer has to give notice to the employee calling upon him to resume his duty. If the employee does not turn up despite such notice, the employer should hold inquiry on that ground and then pass appropriate order of termination. At the time when employment is scarce, ordinarily abandonment of service by employee cannot be presumed. Moreover, abandonment of service is always a matter of intention and such intention in the absence of supportable evidence cannot be attributed to the employee. It goes without saying that whether the employee has abandoned the service or not is always a question of fact which has to be adjudicated on the basis of evidence and attending circumstances. In the present case employer has miserably failed to discharge the burden by leading evidence that employee abandoned service. The Labour Court has considered this aspect, and, in my view rightly reached the conclusion that the employer has failed to establish any abandonment of service and it was a clear case of termination. The termination being illegal, the Labour Court did not commit any error in holding the act of employer as unfair labour practice under Item-I, Schedule IV of the MRTU & PULP Act....."

21. Considering the above law referred on behalf of petitioner and respondents and applying it to the circumstances of the present case there were no service conditions which provided for dispensing with an inquiry or due process in case of alleged abandonment. The notices were not proved to be delivered to the petitioner. RW1 has conceded that the Model Standing Orders Act, 1946 were applicable to the employee of their newspaper. In these circumstances the fact that respondent did not resort to any domestic inquiry for dispensing with the services of the petitioner clearly violated the principles of natural justice and the provisions of Model Standing Orders Act, 1946 and specific provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Governing Act. No requisite permission under Section 33-(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act was sought from

appropriate authority. It is proved that while dispensing with the services of petitioner, respondents acted in a hurry, the notices as already mentioned have been received undelivered. Moreover it is the contention of the petitioner that he time and again approached the office of the respondents however he was not allowed to join his duties. The termination of petitioner was accordingly in violation of the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act and Working Journalist Act. Thus the issue no.1 is partly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issue No.2

22. The petitioner admittedly was working as chief sub editor with the respondents at the time of his illegal termination. As already mentioned above the dispute between the petitioner and respondent with regard to the arrears and wages in accordance with Majithia Wage Board recommendations is not a matter referred before this court by the appropriate authority. Considering the averment of the specific provisions of law and the principle of natural justice the petitioner is held entitled for reinstatement on his post as chief sub editor from the date of his services were dispensed with along-with seniority and continuity in service as well as compensation of Rs. 2 lakh with interest of 9% per annum till the realization of amount in lieu of back wages.

Issues No.6

23. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. Specific plea of abandonment has been raised by the respondents. However it appears from the cross-examination of respondent witness that there was no voluntary abandonment of service by the petitioner. The notices allegedly issued to the petitioner were never delivered to him. No show cause notice, charge-sheet or domestic inquiry was initiated by the respondents in order to collect evidence regarding voluntary abandonment of service by the petitioner. There are no oral or documentary evidence produced before this court which points towards the abandonment of service of the petitioner hence this issue is decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issues No.5, 7 and 8

24. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. The documents have been produced by the respondent i.e. notification Ext. RW1/K, order of Labour Commissioner Ext. RW1/G and statement of petitioner Ext. RW1/H. Perusal of these documents shows that earlier a demand notice was issued by petitioner against the respondent challenging the termination on the basis of which reference Ext. RW1/K was issued. The reference was not adjudicated by the Labour Commissioner however it was withdrawn and it is specifically mentioned in order Ext.RW1/G that the petitioner does not want to proceed with the reference due to technical grounds and withdraws the same with liberty to file afresh case before the authority. Contrary to what is argued concept of resjudicata does not apply to the present dispute as the matter had not been heard and finally decided by the court of competent jurisdiction and reference was withdrawn due to some technical defect. It cannot be held that earlier demand notice was on same cause of action. Perusal of the earlier demand notice shows that it pertains to different date and was withdrawn due to technical ground. The petitioner had raised the demand notice before the appropriate authority regarding his illegal termination. It is never the case of the petitioner that he had abandoned the service. In these circumstances it was not essential for the petitioner to mention the abandonment of service as alleged by respondent before competent authority. Accordingly issues No.5, 7 and 8 are decided in the favour of the petitioner.

RELIEF

25. In view of my discussion on the issues No. 1 to 8 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner is entitled for reinstatement on his post as chief sub editor

from the date his services were dispensed with along-with seniority and continuity in service as well as compensation of Rs.2 lakh with interest of 9% per annum till the realization of amount in lieu of back wages. Parties are left to bear own costs.

26. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 29th day of March, 2025.

Sd/-

(PARVEEN CHAUHAN)
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.) Exercising the Powers of Marriage Officer under Special Marriage Act, 1954

In the matter of :

1. Mr. Ravi Kumar age 30 years s/o Sh. Madan Lal, r/o Village Nagherara, P.O. Gahli, Tehsil Nadaun, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Nishu age 30 years d/o Sh. Magan Dass, r/o Village Gothna, P.O. Palehi, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.)
.. *Appellants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of Marriage

Mr. Ravi Kumar & Ms. Nishu have filed an application under section 05 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith supporting documents in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to get married within three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding their intention, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 27-10-2025. In case no objection is received by 27-10-2025, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the intention of the above said marriage and the same will be allowed accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 25-09-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-SDM,
Sub-Division Barsar (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Vikas Shukla, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Vinay Kumar aged 29 years s/o Sh. Makhan Lal, r/o Ward No. 5, P.O. & Tehsil Alampur, District Kangra (H.P.).

2. Priyanka Kumari aged 25 years d/o Sh. Surinder Kumar, r/o Village Bharthun, P.O. Kanerar, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) . . Applicant.

Versus

The General Public

. . Respondents.

Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Vinay Kumar aged 29 years s/o Sh. Makhan Lal, r/o Ward No. 5, P.O. & Tehsil Alampur, District Kangra (H.P.) and Priyanka Kumari aged 25 years d/o Sh. Surinder Kumar, r/o Village Bharthun, P.O. Kanerar, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 22-09-2025 at Balakrupi Temple, District Kangra (H.P.) as per Hindu rites and customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 12-11-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 23-11-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Naib Tehsildar-cum-Executive Magistrate Dhatwal at Bijhari,
Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Kamlesh Kumari

Versus

General Public

Notice to General Public.

Kamlesh Kumari d/o Hari Ram, r/o Village Bijhari, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) has applied in this office for the entry of her date of birth which has taken place on 17-01-1968 but due to ignorance the same could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Bijhari. The applicant in support of the facts of the event has submitted the requisite documents and the same have been perused accordingly.

General public is hereby informed through this notice that if anyone has any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant *i.e.* 17-01-1968, they can either in person or through counsel can file their objections before the undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, otherwise the matter shall be proceeded further accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 22-09-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
*Executive Magistrate,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Naib Tehsildar-cum-Executive Magistrate Dhatwal at Bijhari,
Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Rikhi Ram

Versus

General Public

Notice to General Public.

Rikhi Ram s/o Chandu Ram, r/o Village Mandiyara, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) has applied in this office for the entry of his date of birth which has taken place on 10-09-1965 but due to ignorance the same could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Dandwin. The applicant in support of the facts of the event has submitted the requisite documents and the same have been perused accordingly.

General public is hereby informed through this notice that if anyone has any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant *i.e.* 10-09-1965, they can either in person or through counsel can file their objections before the undersigned within 30 days from the issue of this publication, otherwise the matter shall be proceeded further accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 22-09-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
*Executive Magistrate,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Sh. Nishant Kumar, H.A.S. Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.)

1. Sher Singh s/o Sh. Dharam Chand, r/o Village Suma, P.O. Dughilag, Tehsil & Distt. Kullu (H.P.).

2. Susila Kami d/o Sh. Ram Bahadur Kami, r/o Ward No. 4, VDC Phulpingkatti Sindhupalchok, Nepal at present r/o Village Suma, P.O. Dughilag, Tehsil & Distt. Kullu (H.P.).

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Proclamation for the registration of marriage under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sher Singh and Susila Kami have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 that they have solemnized their marriage on 16-02-2017 and they are living as husband and wife since then, hence their marriage may be registred under Act *ibid*.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 23-10-2025. The objection received after 23-10-2025 will not be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 24-09-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
(NISHANT KUMAR, HAS),
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.).

In the Court of Special Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Manali, District Kullu (H.P.)

1. Babu Ram Tamang s/o Sh. Chok Tamang, r/o H. No. 91, W. No. 5, Lower Dana Bazar Manali, P.O. & Tehsil Manali, Distt. Kullu (H.P.).

2. Tanzin Dolma d/o Sh. Sh. Angroop, r/o H. No. 70/2,, Village Kaza Soma, Tehsil Spiti, Distt. Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.).

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Notice under the Special Marriage Act.

Babu Ram Tamang s/o Sh. Chok Tamang, r/o H. No. 91, W. No. 5, Lower Dana Bazar Manali, P.O. & Tehsil Manali, Distt. Kullu (H.P.) and Tanzin Dolma d/o Sh. Angroop, r/o H. No.

70/2,, Village Kaza Soma, Tehsil Spiti, Distt. Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith the affidavits in the court of the undersigned stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 23-09-2010 and requested to registered the same under Special Marriage Act. Before taking further action in the said application, objection from the general public are invited for the registration of this marriage through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage under Special Marriage Registration Act, they can file their objection personally or in writing before the court of the undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court today on 18th July, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
(RAMAN KUMAR SHARMA),
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Manali, District Kullu (H.P.).

Office of the Executive Magistrate, Spiti at Kaza, District Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.)

Ref. No. : 342

Date : 17-09-2025

PUBLIC NOTICE

It is hereby informed to the general public that an application has been received in the office of the undersigned regarding the registration of birth of Sh. Tanzin Tandup s/o Sh. Tanzin Zangpo, r/o Village Pangmo, P.O. Hull, Tehsil Spiti, District Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.) who is born on 23-11-2001.

The application for delayed registration has been submitted by him for entering the birth details in the Birth & Death Register of Gram Panchayat Hull.

If any person has any objection regarding the proposed registration of birth of Sh. Tanzin Tandup s/o Sh. Tanzin Zangpo, they may appear in person or through an authorized representative before the undersigned in the court of Executive Magistrate, Spiti at Kaza on 13-10-2025 at 11.00 A.M. alongwith relevant documents and evidence.

If no objections are received by the said date and time, further necessary action for birth registration will be taken as per the norms.

Seal.

Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Spiti at Kaza, District Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.).

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sadar,
District Mandi, H. P.**

In the matter of :—

1. Sh. Kuldeep Kumar s/o Sh. Achhar Singh, Village Manyana, P.O. Tilli, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.).

2. Smt. Jyoti d/o Sh. Hukam Chand, Village Thalehr, P.O. Marathu, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Application for the Registration of Marriage under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sh. Kuldeep Kumar s/o Sh. Achhar Singh, Village Manyana, P.O. Tilli, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) and Smt. Jyoti d/o Sh. Hukam Chand, Village Thalehr, P.O. Marathu, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) at present wife of Sh. Kuldeep Kumar s/o Sh. Achhar Singh, Village Manyana, P.O. Tilli, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 that they have solemnized their marriage on 18-02-2023 according to Hindu rites and customs at their respective houses Mandi, District Mandi (H.P) and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence, their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 19-10-2025, after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued today on 20th day of September, 2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sadar,
District Mandi, H. P.**

In the matter of :—

1. Sh. Romit Kumar Singh s/o Sh. Pradeep Singh, r/o H. No. 4/1, Rajiv Nagar Colony, Kandwa Chitapur Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh-221 106.

2. Smt. Akshita Pathania d/o Sh. Kuldeep Singh Pathania, Village Manyana, P.O. Tilli, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Application for the Registration of Marriage under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sh. Romit Kumar Singh s/o Sh. Pradeep Singh, r/o H. No. 4/1, Rajiv Nagar Colony, Kandwa Chitapur Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh-221 106 and Smt. Akshita Pathania d/o Sh. Kuldeep Singh Pathania, Village Manyana, P.O. Tilli, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) at present wife of (Sh. Romit Kumar Singh s/o Sh. Pradeep Singh, r/o H. No. 4/1, Rajiv Nagar Colony, Kandwa Chitapur Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh-221 106) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 that they have solemnized their marriage on 06-03-2024 according to Hindu rites and customs at Bagla Mukhi Temple Kehnwal, Mandi, District Mandi (H.P) and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence, their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 19-10-2025, after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued today on 20th day of September, 2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sadar,
District Mandi, H. P.**

In the matter of :—

1. Sh. Victor Pradeep J s/o Sh. Jayakumar, r/o Kingston Estate, Karadiyar, Sub-District Yercaud, District Salem, Tamilnadu.

2. Smt. Heena Sharma d/o Sh. Mahender Kumar, r/o H. No. 202/5, Palace Colony Mandi, P.O. Mandi, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Application for the Registration of Marriage under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sh. Victor Pradeep J s/o Sh. Jayakumar, r/o Kingston Estate, Karadiyar, Sub-District Yercaud, District Salem, Tamilnadu and Smt. Heena Sharma d/o Sh. Mahender Kumar, r/o H. No. 202/5, Palace Colony Mandi, P.O. Mandi, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) at present wife of Sh. Victor Pradeep J s/o Sh. Jayakumar, r/o Kingston Estate, Karadiyar, Sub-District Yercaud, District Salem, Tamilnadu have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 that they have solemnized their marriage on 24-02-2017 according to Hindu rites and customs at Hotel Deep Palace Ramnagar Mandi, District Mandi (H.P) and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence, their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 17-10-2025, after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued today on 18th day of September, 2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sadar,
District Mandi, H. P.**

In the matter of :—

1. Sh. Chhagar Rohnitsingh Sukhvinder s/o Sh. Sukhvinder Singh Hardy Singh Chhagar, r/o H. No. 12/221, Opp. Balaji Hanuman Temple, Nava Laxmipura Palanpur, Banaskantha Gujrat.

2. Smt. Modita Behl d/o Sh. Pradeep Behl, r/o 47/6, Lower Samkhetar, Opposite Govt. Girls School Mandi Town, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Application for the Registration of Marriage under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sh. Chhagar Rohnitsingh Sukhvinder s/o Sh. Sukhvinder Singh Hardy Singh Chhagar, r/o H. No. 12/221, Opp. Balaji Hanuman Temple, Nava Laxmipura Palanpur, Banaskantha Gujrat and Smt. Modita Behl d/o Sh. Pradeep Behl, r/o 47/6, Lower Samkhetar, Opposite Govt. Girls School Mandi Town, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.) at present wife of Sh. Chhagar Rohnitsingh Sukhvinder s/o Sh. Sukhvinder Singh Hardy Singh Chhagar, r/o H. No. 12/221, Opp. Balaji Hanuman Temple, Nava Laxmipura Palanpur, Banaskantha Gujrat have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 that they have solemnized their marriage on 11-04-2025 according to Hindu rites and customs at Bhima Kali Complex Bhiuli, Mandi, District Mandi (H.P) and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence, their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 23-10-2025, after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued today on 24th day of September, 2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sadar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

In the court of Executive Magistrate Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.)

Date of Hearing : 13-10-2025

In the matter of :

Sh. Bhadar Mal aged about 40 years s/o Sh. Desh Raj, r/o Village Chauntra, P.O. Chauntra, Tehsil Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.)

Versus

General Public

Application of Sh. Bhadar Mal for correction of name and date of birth in Aadhar Card.

Whereas an application has been received from Sh. Bhadar Mal aged about 40 years s/o Sh. Desh Raj, r/o Village Chauntra, P.O. Chauntra, Tehsil Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.) seeking correction of his name and date of birth in the Aadhar Card. And whereas, as per the records *i.e.* Pariwar Register Nakal, Bonafide Certificate, Caste Certificate and Revenue Record the correct particulars of the applicant are as under :—

- **Name :** Bhadar Mal s/o Desh Raj
- **Date of Birth :** 23-08-1985

But in the Aadhar Card the applicant's particulars have been incorrectly recorded as follows :

- **Name :** Bahadar Mal s/o Desh Raj
- **Date of Birth :** 24-08-1985

Now, therefore, through this notice/ishtihar, the general public is hereby informed and given an opportunity that if anyone has any objection(s) to the proposed correction of the applicant's name as Bhadar mal and date of birth as 23-08-1985, he/she may appear in person or file objection before this court on 13-10-2025. In case of no objection is received or no one appears on the said date then the matter shall be proceeded ex-parte and decided in accordance with law.

This notice is issued today, the 12th day of September, 2025 from this Court.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate,
Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Urban),
District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Mr. Abdul Siddiqui aged about 31 years s/o Sh. Nabi Hussain, r/o Kh. No. 361, Street No. 2, BLK B, Guru Nanak Dev Colony, Bhalswa Diary, Libas Pur, North West Delhi-110 042.
2. Ms. Tara Chatri aged about 29 years d/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, r/o Shej Pal House, Chapslee Estate, Lakkar Bazar Shimla, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Proclamation of the Notice to the intended Marriage under section 5 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Mr. Abdul Siddiqui aged about 31 years s/o Sh. Nabi Hussain, r/o Kh. No. 361, Street No. 2, BLK B, Guru Nanak Dev Colony, Bhalswa Diary, Libas Pur, North West Delhi-110 042 and Ms. Tara Chatri aged about 29 years d/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, r/o Shej Pal House, Chapslee Estate, Lakkar Bazar Shimla, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh have filed an application and affidavits the court of the undersigned under section 5 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 on dated 27th September, 2025 and intend to get married within three calender months from the date hereof.

Therefore, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice, that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 26th October, 2025 from the date of this notice, after that no objection will be entertained and marriage shall be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 27th September, 2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
(OSHIN SHARMA H.A.S.),
*Marriage Officer-cum-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Shimla (Urban).*

Office of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Arki, District Solan (H. P.)

Case No.
35/2025

Date of Institution
24-09-2025

Date of Decision
23-10-2025

Sh. Dhani Ram s/o Sh. Beshakhi, r/o Village Lahamon (Dawti), P.O. Ghanagughat, Tehsil Arki, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh . . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Regarding delayed registration of birth event under section 13(3) of the Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Proclamation

Sh. Dhani Ram s/o Sh. Beshakhi, r/o Village Lahamon (Dawti), P.O. Ghanagughat, Tehsil Arki, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh has filed a case under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavits and other documents stating therein that he was born on 01-08-1963 at Village Lahamon (Dawti), but his birth has not been entered in the records of Gram Panchayat Dawati, Tehsil Arki, District Solan (H.P.) as per the Non availability certificate No. 10 issued by the Registrar, Birth and Death Registration, G.P. Dawti, Tehsil Arki.

Therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection for registration of delayed birth in respect of Sh. Dhani Ram may submit their objections in writing in this office on or before 23-10-2025 at 10.00 A.M. failing which no objection will be entertained afterwards.

Given under my hand and seal of this office on this 24th day of September, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Arki, District Solan (H.P.).*

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sarita Kumari w/o Sh. Ajay Kumar, r/o Village Manjhiar, P.O. & Tehsil Shahpur, District Kangra (H.P.) declare that I want to change my minor son's name from Arunabh to Arunabh Dogra.

SARITA KUMARI
w/o Sh. Ajay Kumar,
r/o Village Manjhiar,
P.O. & Tehsil Shahpur, District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Meeran Devi w/o Sh. Karam Singh, r/o Village Kosar, P.O. Dera Parol, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Meera Devi to Meeran Devi for all purposes in future. Please note.

MEERAN DEVI
w/o Sh. Karam Singh,
r/o Village Kosar, P.O. Dera Parol,
Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sarita Devi w/o Sh. Pradeep Singh, r/o Village Darogan, P.O. Thana Bajuri, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Divanshi to Devanshi for all purposes in future. Please note.

SARITA DEVI
w/o Sh. Pradeep Singh,
r/o Village Darogan, P.O. Thana Bajuri,
Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Himachal Kumari w/o Late Sh. Onkar Nath Sharma, r/o Ward No. 05, Village Bharmat, P.O. Banuri, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Himachali Sharma to Himachal Kumari for all purposes in future. Please note.

HIMACHAL KUMARI
w/o Late Sh. Onkar Nath Sharma,
r/o Ward No. 05, Village Bharmat,
P.O. Banuri, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Pushpa Devi w/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, r/o Village Balh Bagh, P.O. Mehal, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Vashanevi to Vaishnavi for all purposes in future. All concerned please may note.

PUSHPA DEVI
w/o Sh. Ashok Kumar
r/o Village Balh Bagh, P.O. Mehal,
Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Darshan Kumar s/o Sh. Maan Singh, r/o Village Padhar, P.O. Rari, Tehsil & District Chamba (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Dippl to Dimple for all purposes in future. All concerned please may note.

DARSHAN KUMAR
s/o Sh. Maan Singh,
r/o Village Padhar, P.O. Rari,
Tehsil & District Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Jai Karan s/o Sh. Prem Lal, r/o Ward No. 1, V.P.O. Nandher, Tehsil & District Kangra (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor son's name from Vanshas Gour to Vanshaj Gour. All concerned please may note.

JAI KARAN
s/o Sh. Prem Lal,
r/o Ward No. 1, V.P.O. Nandher,
Tehsil & District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Arjun Singh s/o Sh. Minku Ram, r/o Village Paroha, P.O. Materni, Sub-Tehsil Darlaghat, District Solan (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Jehanvi to Jahanvi. All concerned please may note.

ARJUN SINGH
s/o Sh. Minku Ram,
r/o Village Paroha, P.O. Materni,
Sub-Tehsil Darlaghat, District Solan (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sushma (New Name) w/o Sh. Devender, r/o Village Barawan, Tehsil Theog, Bagon Sandhu (1), Shimla, Sandhu, (H.P.)-171222 declare that I have changed my name from Susjma Verma (Old Name) to Sushma (New Name). All concerned please may note.

SUSHMA
w/o Sh. Devender,
r/o Village Barawan, Tehsil Theog,
Bagon Sandhu (1), Shimla, Sandhu, (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Prakasho s/o Sh. Soni, r/o Village Niyola, P.O. Paliur, Tehsil & District Chamba (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Prakash Chand s/o Soni Ram to Prakasho s/o Soni for all purposes in future. All concerned please may note.

PRAKASHO
s/o Sh. Soni,
r/o Village Niyola, P.O. Paliur,
Tehsil & District Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Priya (UIN-8543-1417-2224) d/o Sh. Nand Kishore Misher, r/o H. No. 105/1, Nawani Ka Bag, Block No. 34, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Priya to Vibha Devi. All concerned please may note.

PRIYA

d/o Sh. Nand Kishore Misher,
r/o H. No. 105/1, Nawani Ka Bag, Block No. 34,
Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं०
104 / 2025 / TEH

तारीख दायरा
10-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थी उपेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र मोती राम पुत्र भगत राम, निवासी महाल हटवास, तहसील नगरोटा बगवां,
जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसका नाम महाल दौलतपुर में रविन्द्र पाल पुत्र मोती राम दर्ज है जोकि गलत है जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थी का नाम उपेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र मोती राम दर्ज है जोकि सही है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी का सही नाम रविन्द्र पाल के बजाए उपेन्द्र कुमार उर्फ रविन्द्र पाल पुत्र मोती राम सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06-10-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 23-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0
102/2025/TEH

तारीख दायरा
24-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थी मुन्ना लाल पुत्र माधो राम पुत्र जंगू, निवासी गांव व डाकघर नंदेहड़, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसके दादा का नाम राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल व मौजा नंदेहड़ में घसीटा व महाल पटारकड़ में जंगू पटवार वृत्त मटौर में अलग-अलग नाम दर्ज है जोकि सही न है। प्रार्थी अपने दादा का नाम घसीटा उपनाम जंगू महाल नंदेहड़ व पटारकड़, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा में सही नाम दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी के दादा का सही नाम घसीटा व जंगू के बजाए घसीटा उपनाम जंगू पुत्र सौहणू सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06-10-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0
103/2025/TEH

तारीख दायरा
03-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थी निकेश पुत्र संजीव कुमार पुत्र कर्ण सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर इच्छी खास, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसका नाम महाल इच्छी, पटवार वृत्त इच्छी में अनिकेत दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थी का सही नाम निकेश पुत्र संजीव कुमार दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी का सही नाम अनिकेत के बजाए निकेश पुत्र संजीव कुमार पुत्र कर्ण सिंह सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06-10-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं०
101/2025/TEH

तारीख दायरा
03-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थी रणजीत सिंह पुत्र ईशवर दास, निवासी गांव व डाकघर राजल, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसका नाम महाल घमारकड़, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा में भूरी सिंह दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थी का सही नाम रणजीत सिंह दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी का सही नाम भूरि सिंह कं बजाए भूरी सिंह उपनाम रणजीत सिंह पुत्र इशवर दास पुत्र परमा सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06-10-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं०
106/2025/TEH

तारीख दायरा
10-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थिया सानू सुपुत्री वलविन्दर भाटिया, निवासी महाल खर्ती, डाकघर धमेहड़, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 ।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे ।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थिया द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है । प्रार्थिया द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसके पिता का नाम महाल हार, मौजा दौलतपुर, पटवार वृत्त दौलतपुर में वलविन्दर सिंह पुत्र किशन चन्द दर्ज है जोकि गलत है । जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थिया के पिता का नाम वलविन्दर भाटिया पुत्र किशन चन्द दर्ज है, जोकि सही है । अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थिया के पिता का सही नाम वलविन्दर सिंह के बजाए वलविन्दर भाटिया उपनाम वलविन्दर सिंह पुत्र किशन चन्द सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06-10-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं । निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 23-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं०
105/2025/TEH

तारीख दायरा
10-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थी रजत भाटिया पुत्र राजमल, निवासी महाल मन्हाल, मौजा दौलतपुर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 ।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसका नाम महाल दौलतपुर में रजत पुत्र राजमल दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थी का नाम रजत भाटिया पुत्र राजमल दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी का सही नाम रजत के बजाए रजत भाटिया पुत्र राजमल सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06-10-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 23-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / -

सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील कांगड़ा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

मिसल नं०
51 / 2025

तारीख दायरा
17-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
13-10-2025

पंजीकरण प्रार्थिया श्रीमती राजिन्द्रा कुमारी सुपुत्री प्रताप चन्द, निवासी गांव वीरता, डाकघर कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण बारे।

पंजीकरण प्रार्थिया श्रीमती राजिन्द्रा कुमारी सुपुत्री प्रताप चन्द, निवासी गांव वीरता, डाकघर कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा ने प्रार्थना-पत्र बाबत जन्म तारीख पंजीकरण प्रस्तुत किया गया है प्रार्थिया द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 12-01-1980 को हुआ था। लेकिन उक्त जन्म तारीख पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत जोगीपुर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न हो सका है। अतः उक्त तारीख को दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किए जाएं।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त जन्म तारीख पंजीकरण बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 13-10-2025 को दोपहर 2.00 बजे अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। एतराज प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-09-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील कांगड़ा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं०
98/2025/TEH

तारीख दायरा
10-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थी सुखदेव पुत्र नीरुराम, निवासी गांव व डाकघर तियारा खास, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू—राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना—पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसका नाम महाल भंलू, पटवार वृत्त तियारा में सुखराम पुत्र नीरू दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थी का नाम सुखदेव पुत्र नीरू दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी का सही नाम सुखराम के बजाए सुखदेव पुत्र नीरू राम पुत्र मकोडू सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06-10-2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं०
20/2025/TEH

तारीख दायरा
03-09-2025

तारीख पेशी
06-10-2025

प्रार्थी सुरिन्द्र कुमार पुत्र वलदेव राज, निवासी गांव घन्डूह, मौजा गांहलिया, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू—राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना—पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसके पिता का नाम महाल घण्डूह में वली राम दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम वलदेव राज पुत्र किहरो दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी के पिता का सही नाम वली राम के बजाए वली राम उपनाम वलदेव राज पुत्र किहरो पुत्र सत्यागर सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06—10—2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24—09—2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा,
तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं०
108 / 2025 / TEH

तारीख दायरा
24—09—2025

तारीख पेशी
06—10—2025

प्रार्थी राजीव नंदा पुत्र मेहर चन्द, निवासी गांव व डाकघर नंदेहड़, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 37(2) भू—राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 के अन्तर्गत नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु प्रार्थना—पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसका नाम महाल नंदेहड़, पटवार वृत्त मटौर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 के राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी का नाम राजीव कुमार दर्ज है जोकि गलत है। जबकि अन्य कागजात में प्रार्थी का नाम राजीव नंदा दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। अतः राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी का सही नाम राजीव कुमार के बजाए राजीव कुमार उपनाम राजीव नंदा पुत्र मेहर चन्द सही इन्द्राज दर्ज किया जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष दिनांक 06—10—2025 को हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। निर्धारित अवधि तक एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-09-2025 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार कांगड़ा, तहसील व
जिला कांगड़ा, (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0	तकसीम	तारीख पेशी
90 / 2023		24-09-2025
91 / 2023		

शेर सिंह बनाम किशोरी लाल आदि ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि0प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, बाबत भूमि खाता नं0 77, खतौनी नं0 142, खसरा नम्बर 214, कित्ता 1, रकबा 0-05-56 हैक्टयर, व खाता नं0 76, खतौनी नं0 140, खसरा नम्बरान 149, 286, 287, 288, 290, 293, 506, 507, 651, 1354, 289, कित्ता 11, रकबा 0-17-89 है0 स्थित महाल देहरियां, पटवार वृत्त समीरपुर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा ।

इश्तहार/मुश्री मुनादी ।

उपरोक्त तकसीम प्रकरण इस अदालत में जेरे समायत है। प्रत्यार्थीगण किशोरी लाल, विपन कुमार, राजेशवर कुमार पुत्र सालीग्राम, निवासी महाल देहरियां, पटवार वृत्त समीरपुर व श्रीमती सोमा देवी पत्नी शेर सिंह, निवासी महाल खोली, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा व श्रीमती विमला देवी पत्नी रणजीत सिंह, निवासी महाल इच्छी, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा व देवी सराह पत्नी प्रशोतम, निवासी महाल वड़ी हलेड़, वालाजी हास्पिटल कांगड़ा को इस अदालत द्वारा समन जारी किए गए लेकिन उक्त प्रतिवादी हाजिर अदालत न आ रहे हैं। जिससे इस अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादी की इत्तलाह साधारण तरीके से न हो सकती है। अतः इस इश्तहार/मुश्री मुनादी द्वारा तामील करवाई जाती है।

अतः उपरोक्त फरीकैन को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 04-11-2025 को बाद दोपहर 2.00 बजे अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज इस तकसीम बारे पेश कर सकते हैं। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में नियमानुसार प्रार्थना-पत्र पर कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-09-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील कांगड़ा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0	तारीख दायरा	तारीख पेशी
52 / 2025	24-09-2025	13-10-2025

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती सुमन कान्ता पत्नी सुखदेव सिंह पुत्र रूमली देवी, निवासी गांव व डाकघर जमानावाद, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण बारे।

प्रार्थना—पत्र प्रार्थिया बाबत मृत्यु तारीख पंजीकरण प्रार्थिया श्रीमती सुमन कान्ता पत्नी सुखदेव सिंह पुत्र रूमली देवी, निवासी महाल, गांव व डाकघर जमानावाद, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा द्वारा प्रस्तुत किया गया है। प्रार्थिया द्वारा आग्रह किया गया है कि उसकी सास श्रीमती रूमली पत्नी रघुनाथ सिंह की मृत्यु दिनांक 25-04-1990 को हुई थी। लेकिन उक्त मृत्यु तारीख पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत जमानावाद के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न हो सकी है। अतः उक्त तारीख को दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किए जाएं।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त मृत्यु तारीख पंजीकरण बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 13-10-2025 को दोपहर 2.00 बजे अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। एतराज प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना—पत्र पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-05-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील कांगड़ा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार कांगड़ा, तहसील व
जिला कांगड़ा, (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0
47/25/TEH

तकसीम

तारीख पेशी
15-10-2025

विक्रम जीत आदि

बनाम

लायक राम आदि।

प्रार्थना—पत्र तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि0प्र0 भू—राजस्व अधिनियम, बाबत भूमि खाता नं0 226, खतौनी नं0 311, खसरा नम्बर 680, कित्ता 1, रकबा 0-12-26 हैक्टियर, स्थित महाल सौहड़ा, पटवार वृत्त अवदुल्लापुर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा।

इशतहार/मुश्री मुनादी।

उपरोक्त तकसीम प्रकरण इस अदालत में जेरे समायत है। प्रत्यार्थी लायक राम पुत्र माया दास पुत्र चमारू व अनू चौधरी पुत्र रमेश कुमार, निवासी महाल गगल बार्ड नं0 5, पटवार वृत्त गगल खास, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा को इस अदालत द्वारा समन जारी किए गए लेकिन उक्त प्रतिवादी हाजिर अदालत न आ रहे हैं। जिससे इस अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादी की इत्तलाह साधारण तरीके से न हो सकती है। अतः इस इशतहार/मुश्री मुनादी द्वारा तामील करवाई जाती है।

अतः उपरोक्त फरीकैन को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 15-10-2025 को बाद दोपहर 2.00 बजे अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज इस तकसीम बारे पेश कर सकते हैं। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में नियमानुसार प्रार्थना-पत्र पर कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 17-09-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार कांगड़ा, तहसील व
जिला कांगड़ा, (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0
43 / 25 / TEH

तकसीम

तारीख पेशी
15-10-2025

जीवन लता आदि

बनाम

लायक राम आदि।

प्रार्थना-पत्र तकसीम जेर धारा 123 हि0प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, बाबत भूमि खाता नं0 225, खतौनी नं0 310, खसरा नम्बर 195, 685, कित्ता 2, रकबा 0-12-16 हैक्टेयर, स्थित महाल सौहड़ा, पटवार वृत्त अवदुल्लापुर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा।

इशतहार / मुशत्री मुनादी।

उपरोक्त तकसीम प्रकरण इस अदालत में जेरे समायत है। प्रत्यार्थी लायक राम पुत्र माया दास पुत्र चमारू व अनू चौधरी पुत्र रमेश कुमार, निवासी महाल गगल बार्ड नं0 5, पटवार वृत्त गगल खास, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा को इस अदालत द्वारा समन जारी किए गए लेकिन उक्त प्रतिवादी हाजिर अदालत न आ रहे हैं। जिससे इस अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादी की इत्तलाह साधारण तरीके से न हो सकती है। अतः इस इशतहार / मुशत्री मुनादी द्वारा तामील करवाई जाती है।

अतः उपरोक्त फरीकैन को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 15-10-2025 को बाद दोपहर 2.00 बजे अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज इस तकसीम बारे पेश कर सकते हैं। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में नियमानुसार प्रार्थना-पत्र पर कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 17-09-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

किस्म मुकद्दमा : दुरुस्ती नाम बारे।

अविनाश चड्ढा पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री राम, निवासी वार्ड नं0 66, मकान नं0 263, कोतवाली बाजार, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना—पत्र बाबत नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे अविनाश चड्ढा पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री राम, निवासी वार्ड नं0 66, मकान नं0 263, कोतवाली बाजार, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

प्रार्थी अविनाश चड्ढा पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री राम, निवासी वार्ड नं0 66, मकान नं0 263, कोतवाली बाजार, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 ने शपथ—पत्र सहित इस अदालत में प्रार्थना—पत्र दायर किया है कि उसका नाम उप—महाल धर्मशाला में रमेश चंद पुत्र स्वर्गीय राम लाल दर्ज है जो कि गलत है। प्रार्थी अपना नाम राजस्व रिकार्ड उप—महाल धर्मशाला में रमेश चंद उपनाम अविनाश चड्ढा पुत्र राम लाल दर्ज करवाना चाहता है जोकि प्रार्थी का सही व प्रचलित नाम है। प्रार्थी द्वारा इसकी पुष्टि के लिए शपथ—पत्र, आधार कार्ड की छाया प्रति भी साथ लगाई गई है। मिसल को छानबीन हेतु हल्का कानूनगो द्वितीय को भेजा गया। राजस्व अभिकरण द्वारा प्रार्थी द्वारा दिये गए दस्तावेजों का अवलोकन किया गया व उचित छानबीन की गई तथा अपनी रिपोर्ट इस कार्यालय में प्रेषित की।

अतः इस इशतहार राजपत्र के द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित पक्षों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उपरोक्त अविनाश चड्ढा पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री राम लाल, निवासी वार्ड नं0 66, मकान नं0 263, कोतवाली बाजार, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 के नाम की दुरुस्ती करने बारे कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह हमारी अदालत में दिनांक 06-10-2025 को उपस्थित होकर अपने उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में नाम दुरुस्त करने बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर या एतराज न सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 25-09-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।