



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

सोमवार, 05 मई, 2025 / 15 वैशाख, 1947

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 28th April, 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 of
25—राजपत्र / 2025—05—05—2025 (1535)

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”:—

Sr. No.	Ref. No.	Petitioner	Respondent	Date of Award/Order
1.	107/18	Prem Lal	D.F.O. Suket	28.02.2025
2.	19/19	Sanjeev Kumar	D.F.O. Suket	28.02.2025
3.	01/20	Pawan Kumar	D.F.O. Suket	28.02.2025
4.	11/23	Vyas Dev	D.F.O. Chamba	28.02.2025

By order,

Sd/-
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 (H.P.)

Reference No. : 107/2018
Date of Institution : 29.12.2018
Date of Decision : 28.02.2025

Shri Prem Lal s/o Shri Sunder Singh, r/o Village Jadharyani, P.O. Patrighat, Tehsil Baldwara, District Mandi, H.P. *..Petitioner.*

Versus

The Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. *..Respondent.*

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

For the Petitioner : Sh. S.K. Sharma, Ld. Adv.
For Respondent : Ms. Shaveta Ji, Ld. ADA

AWARD

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

“Whether time to time termination of services of Shri Prem Lal s/o Shri Sunder Singh, r/o Village Jadharyani, P.O. Patrighat, Tehsil Baldwara, District Mandi, H.P. during July, 2005 to January, 2016 by the Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar,

District Mandi, H.P., without complying with the provisions of 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 employer?"

2. After receipt of above reference, a corrigendum reference dated 15th January, 2020 has been received from the appropriate government for adjudication which reads as follows:—

“Whereas, a reference has been made to the Ld. Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P. vide notification of even no. dated 03-12-2018 for legal adjudication. However, inadvertently the correct facts could not be mentioned about the date of time to time termination of the workman in the said notification. Therefore, the date of time to time termination of the workman may be read as “November, 1994 to January, 2016” instead of “July, 2005 to January, 2016” as alleged by workman”

3. The brief facts as stated in the amended claim petition are that the petitioner was engaged on daily rated forest worker by the forest department in its Suket Forest Division under Forest Range Baldwara in June, 1993 and he being granted fictional breaks by the department w.e.f. his initial engagement till date. It is alleged that the respondent has wrongly and illegally granted fictional breaks to the applicant/petitioner. However at the same time the department had allowed juniors to the petitioner to complete 240 days in each calendar year. While granting fictional breaks to the petitioner at the same time juniors to the petitioner namely Bhoop Singh, Khem Singh, Roshan Lal, Piru Ram, Judhya Devi, Leela Dhar, Nand Lal, Jai Ram, Sita Devi, Jaiwanti, Vidya Sagar, Bego Ram, Duni Chand, Virender Kumr, Angat Kumar, Anil Kumar and Brij Lal were allowed to complete 240 days in each calendar year. During the said fictional breaks period the petitioner had requested the respondent department not to grant him fictional breaks but the respondent department lingered on the matter on one pretext or other and continuously granted fictional breaks to the petitioner since his initial engagement till date. The petitioner visited the office of respondent number of times and requested to count his fictional breaks period towards his seniority but the respondent lingered on the matter and finally on 23.9.2017 has refused to admit the claim of the petitioner. It is asserted that the services of many juniors to the petitioner had been regularized by the department including one Shri Angat Kumar, Anil Kumar and Brij Lal, however the petitioner is entitled for regularization in terms of Mool Raj Upadhyay's case since had he not granted fictional breaks in the year 1993 he might have completed 240 days in a calendar year of 1993 i.e. before 31.12.1993. It is asserted that the case of the petitioner also covered under judgment passed by Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh in CWP No.2735/2010 titled as Rakesh Kumar vs. State of H.P. & Ors. decided on 20.7.2010 as well as eight years policy of the Government. It is further asserted that the petitioner was not gainfully employed during period of his fictional breaks. It is alleged that the act of the respondent was not only wrong and illegal but against the provisions of Sections 25-B and 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as well as Constitution of India. In accordance with Mool Raj Upadhyay's case and Rakesh Kumar's case the petitioner is being entitled for continuity in service and regularization. It is prayed that the present claim petition may be allowed and fictional breaks granted to the petitioner since his initial engagement till date may be declared wrong, illegal and period of fictional breaks may be counted towards the seniority and continuity in service of the petitioner. It is also prayed that as per Mool Raj Upadhyay's case/Rakesh Kumar's case the services of petitioner may be regularized as well as eight years policy of H.P. Government along-with other consequential service benefits i.e. back wages, arrear, compensation etc.

3. In amended reply to the claim petition the respondent has raised preliminary objections qua maintainability, locus standi, suppression of material facts, petition being barred by delay and laches and estoppel. On merits, it is submitted that as per available record the petitioner had worked during July, 2005 and August, 2005 on muster roll basis and from 2006 to 2016 on bill

basis as per availability of work and funds, thereafter the petitioner is still working on quotations/tender basis. It is asserted that as per mandays chart the petitioner has not completed 240 days in each calendar year. No fictional breaks were given to the petitioner, however the petitioner used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and convince. It is asserted that due to act and conduct of the petitioner he could not be completed 240 days in any calendar year. It is submitted that the record upto March, 2000 was gutted in fire. The petitioner has never approached the respondent department, moreover, no fictional breaks were given to the petitioner but petitioner worked intermittently and used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and convenience. It is asserted that as and when the petitioner approached the respondent department his services were utilized subject to availability of work and funds. It is asserted that the respondent department had regularized only those daily wagers who have fulfilled the criteria fixed under the regularization policy of daily wagers. It is asserted that Angat Kumar, Anil Kumar and Brij Lal were seniors to the applicant/petitioner. It is mentioned that the case of the petitioner is different and not covered under the judgments of Mool Raj Upadhyay's case and Rakesh Kumar's case. The petitioner was gainfully employed himself as an agriculturist. It is asserted that the petitioner was intermittent worker who used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and the question of violation of any of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not arise. Other averments made in the petition were denied and it is prayed that petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

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

1. Whether time to time termination of services of the petitioner during November, 1994 to January, 2016 by the respondent is violation of the provisions contained under the Act, as alleged? ..OPP (as amended).
2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative, to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? ..OPP.
3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..OPR
4. Whether the petitioner has no locus standi to file the present case, as alleged? ..OPR
5. Whether the petitioner has not approached this Tribunal with clean hands and has suppressed the material facts, as alleged? ..OPR.

Relief.

6. In order to prove his case the petitioner has examined Shri Mehar Singh s/o Gorakh Ram as PW1, Shri Lekh Ram s/o Shri Kanhiya Ram as PW2, Shri Nanak Chand s/o Shri Balak Ram as PW3 by way of examination-in-chief. Petitioner examined himself by way of affidavit as PW-4. He also produced on record documents i.e. copy of demand notice Ext. P-1 and copies of muster rolls Mark-A to Mark-E. The petitioner has also examined one Shri Kuldeep Chand, Dy. Range/Block Officer, Baldwara Range, Suket Forest Division Sunder Nagar, District Mandi as PW5 by way of examination-in-chief. He has also produced on record seniority list Ext. PW5/A, seniority list upto 31.12.2007 Ext. PW5/B, Mandays chart Ext. PW5/C, regularization order Ext. PW5/D, another regularization order Ext. PW5/F, regularization order Ext. PW5/G.

7. Respondent has examined Shri Rakesh Katoch, presently posted as Deputy Conservator of Forest, Suket Forest Division, Sundernagar by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein he reiterated the facts mentioned in the reply. He also produced on record mandays chart Ext. RW1/B, copy of GD entry Ext. RW1/C, copy of muster roll Ext. RW1/D, copy of muster roll Ext. RW1/E, copy of bills Ext. RW1/F, copy of receipts Ext. RW1/G, copy of quotation Ext. RW1/H, copy of bill Ext. RW1/J, copy of bill Ext. RW1/K, copy of quotation Ext. RW1/L and copy of bills and quotations Ext. RW1/M, copy of bills/sanctions and quotations Ext. RW1/N.

8. I have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Assistant District Attorney for the respondent 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 : Yes

Issue No. 2 : Decided accordingly

Issue No. 3 : No

Issue No. 4 : No

Issue No. 5 : No

Relief. : Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1

10. The petitioner Prem Lal is asserted in his claim that he was engaged as daily rated forest worker by Forest Department in Suket Division under Forest Range Baldwara in June, 1993. He was intentionally granted fictional breaks despite request on his behalf and respondent allowed his juniors to complete 240 days of work in each calendar year. Respondent asserts that the petitioner was merely worked for few days since 2006 to 2016. He never worked continuously completing 240 days in a calendar year and that he was engaged on muster basis as well as bill basis.

11. PW1 Mehar Singh states that petitioner had done plantation and fencing work and he has engaged in the year 1993. He also states that petitioner had worked sometime on bill basis and sometime on muster roll basis. He admits that the petitioner has worked on muster roll before 2005 and thereafter on bill basis. He denied that petitioner was called by the department only when the work was available but he asserts that the work was always available with the department. PW2 and PW3 Lekh Ram and Nanak Chand are Pradhan and Forest Mali respectively. These witnesses have also asserted that petitioner was working in the department since 1993. They both denied that petitioner had not worked on regular basis but merely on seasonal basis. Petitioner in his cross-examination has also denied that he worked only *w.e.f.* July, 2005 to August, 2005 on muster roll basis and since December, 2006 to 2016 on bill basis. He denied that he had worked with the department as per availability of work. Petitioner also denied that he used to leave the work at his own sweet will and convenience. He has denied that he was engaged by department only when the work and funds available.

12. Contrary to the contention of the respondent that the petitioner was engaged in 2005 only the muster roll. Ext. RW1/D and Ext. RW1/E depicts the employment of petitioner since the year 1994 i.e. specifically for the month of November, 1994, December, 1994, January, 1995, July, September and November, 1995. In addition to it there are bills Ext. RW1/F, Ext. RW1/G, Ext. RW1/H, Ext. RW1/J, Ext. RW1/K, Ext. RW1/M and Ext. RW1/N produced by respondent with

regard to the work done by the petitioner. The consolidation of bills Ext. RW1/F depicts that the petitioner has worked on bill basis since 2007 till the year 2016. The record of muster roll from the year 1993 to year 2000 is alleged to have been burnt in fire as is evident from the document Ext. PW1/B. Despite this the mandays chart Ext. RW1/B from the year 2005 upto year 2016 concerning the petitioner has been produced on the case file. A careful reading of above documents that since the year 2005 petitioner was made to work alternatively on bills and muster roll basis clearly with a view to depriving him of the benefits of continuous service for a period of 240 days of work in a calendar year. The record prior to the year 2005 is alleged to have been burnt but petitioner has produced on record muster rolls for the years 1994 and 1995 which are not disputed by the respondent and depict the employment of the petitioner during that period also. It has been held by Hon'ble High Court in **Ram Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others in CWP No.789 of 2024, decided on 4.7.2024** has observed in para nos. 5 and 6 as follows:—

- “5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is serving with the respondents-Department since 2015 continuously by putting in more than 240 days in each calendar. It appears that in order to deny such kind of workmen, the benefits of regularization, respondent-State has come with the nomenclature of “bill basis” but, fact of the matter still remains that be it a daily wage worker or a bill basis worker, he is serving the Department regularly putting in more than 240 days in each calendar.
6. This Court of the considered view that the distinction, which is now being created by the respondents- Department between a daily wage worker and a bill base worker is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Be it a daily wage worker or a bill base worker, he is rendering the same service to the Department. Therefore, in the absence of their being any intelligible differentia between a daily wage worker and bill base worker, the classification that has been made by the Department cannot pass the touch stone of Article 14 of the Constitution of India”.

13. The respondent has miserably failed to controvert the contention of the petitioner that he had worked with respondent department since the year 1994, 1995 and continued to work till the year 2016. The contention of the respondent that the petitioner himself has not completed 240 days of work in a calendar year is not substantiated from any document/notice or other record produced by the respondent to show that they had offered work to the petitioner or issued any show cause notice when the petitioner did not appear for performance of his duties. There is nothing on record that there was non availability of work and funds. No notification has been produced by the respondent show that the work in their department is primarily of seasonal nature. This contention of respondent is further falsified from the seniority list Ext. PW5/A and Ext. PW5/B which clearly shows that persons employed in the department during years subsequent deployment of the petitioner have been allowed to complete 240 days of work in a calendar year and also qualified for being regularized as per the policy of the government. The respondent has hence violated the basic fundamental rights of the petitioner and also the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act applicable to petitioner as a workman. No reason is stated as to why person employed subsequent to the petitioner was allowed to complete 240 days of work in a calendar year and petitioner was deprived of the similar benefits. The provisions of fictional breaks in service of the petitioner and the change of his service condition from muster roll basis/daily wages to bill basis without mandatory notice amounts to violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and unfair labour practices on the part of the respondent. In these circumstances since the documents of department show that petitioner had starting work with the respondent since November, 1994, the time to time breaks in service of Prem Lal (petitioner) from the year November, 1994 to 2016 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not legal and justified. Issue no.1 is accordingly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issue No. 2

14. It has been proved from the evidence on the case file that the petitioner had started working with respondent since November, 1994 and continuously worked till 2016. The respondent has however failed to confirm the work charge status on the petitioner and other consequential benefits considering the length of his services. As described while deciding issue no.1 above the fictional breaks intentionally provided by respondent in the continuous service of the petitioner from 1994 onwards the period of fictional break is liable to be condoned. The petitioner is entitled for continuity in service, seniority and conferment of work charge status of regularization of service from the date of completion of 8 years *w.e.f.* initial appointment i.e. November, 1994 with consequential benefits except back wages. The petitioner is entitled compensation to the tune of Rs. 2 lakh along with interest 9% in lieu of back wages. Issue No. 2 is accordingly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issues No. 3,4 and 5

15. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. The respondent has not been able to produce record pertaining to the actual employment of the petitioner since the year 1994 in a complete manner. The documents as well as oral statements of witnesses clearly points toward the fact that petitioner was in continued service with the respondent since the year 1994 with a period of fictional breaks liable to be condoned. Thus the present claim is maintainable, petitioner has the *locus standi* to file the present claim petition and there are no evidence on record to show that the petitioner has suppressed the material facts from the court. Hence all these issues are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

16. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 5 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner shall be considered to be in a continuous service as daily wagger from November, 1994 onwards. The petitioner is entitled for continuity in service, seniority and conferment of work charge status of regularization of service from the date of completion of 8 years *w.e.f.* initial appointment i.e. November, 1994 with consequential benefits except back wages. The petitioner is entitled compensation to the tune of Rs. 2 lakh along with interest 9% in lieu of back wages. Parties are left to bear their costs.

17. 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 28th day of February, 2025.

Sd/-
(Parveen Chauhan)
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

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

Reference No. : 19/2019
Date of Institution : 25.2.2019
Date of Decision : 28.02.2025

Shri Sanjeev Kumar s/o Shri Lekh Ram, r/o Village Lakhyan, P.O. Baldwara, Tehsil Baldwara, District Mandi, H.P. ...*Petitioner.*

Versus

The Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ...*Respondent.*

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

For the Petitioner : Sh. S.K. Sharma, Ld. Adv.
 For Respondent : Ms. Shaveta Ji, Ld. ADA

AWARD

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

“Whether time to time termination of daily wages/bill basis services of Shri Sanjeev Kumar s/o Shri Lekh Ram, r/o Village Lakhyan, P.O. Baldwara, Tehsil Baldwara, District Mandi, H.P. during April, 2000 to February, 2016 by the Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., without complying with the provisions of 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 employer?”

2. After receipt of above reference, a corrigendum reference dated 16th January, 2020 has been received from the appropriate government for adjudication which reads as follows:—

“Whereas, a reference has been made to the Ld. Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P. *vide* notification of even no. dated 21-01-2019 for legal adjudication. However, inadvertently the correct facts could not be mentioned about the date of time to time termination of the workman in the said notification. Therefore, the date of time to time termination of the workman may be read as “year, 1995 to February, 2016” instead of “April, 2000 to February, 2016” as alleged by workman”

3. The brief facts as stated in the amended claim petition are that the petitioner was engaged on daily waged forest worker by the forest department in its Suket Forest Division under Forest Range Baldwara in June, 1993 and he being granted fictional breaks by the department *w.e.f.* his initial engagement till date. It is alleged that the respondent has wrongly and illegally granted fictional breaks to the applicant/petitioner. However at the same time the department had allowed juniors to the petitioner to complete 240 days in each calendar year. While granting fictional breaks to the petitioner at the same time juniors to the petitioner namely Bhoop Singh, Khem Singh, Roshan Lal, Piru Ram, Judhya Devi, Leela Dhar, Nand Lal, Jai Ram, Sita Devi, Jaiwanti, Vidya Sagar, Bego Ram. Duni Chand, Virender Kumar, Angat Kumar, Anil Kumar and Brij Lal were

allowed to complete 240 days in each calendar year. During the said fictional breaks period the petitioner had requested the respondent department not to grant him fictional breaks but the respondent department lingered on the matter on one pretext or other and continuously granted fictional breaks to the petitioner since his initial engagement till date. The petitioner visited the office of respondent number of times and requested to count his fictional breaks period towards his seniority but the respondent lingered on the matter and finally on 23.9.2017 has refused to admit the claim of the petitioner. It is asserted that the services of many juniors to the petitioner had been regularized by the department including one Shri Angat Kumar, Anil Kumar and Brij Lal, however the petitioner is entitled for regularization in terms of Mool Raj Upadhayay's case since had he not granted fictional breaks in the year 1993 he might have completed 240 days in a calendar year of 1993 *i.e.* before 31.12.1993. It is asserted that the case of the petitioner also covered under judgment passed by Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh in CWP No.2735/2010 titled as Rakesh Kumar vs. State of H.P. & Ors. decided on 20.7.2010 as well as eight years policy of the Government. It is further asserted that the petitioner was not gainfully employed during period of his fictional breaks. It is alleged that the act of the respondent was not only wrong and illegal but against the provisions of Sections 25-B and 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as well as Constitution of India. In accordance with Mool Raj Upadhayay's case and Rakesh Kumar's case the petitioner is entitled for continuity in service and regularization. It is prayed that the present claim petition may be allowed and fictional breaks granted to the petitioner since his initial engagement till date may be declared wrong, illegal and period of fictional breaks may be counted towards the seniority and continuity in service of the petitioner. It is also prayed that as per Mool Raj Upadhayay's case/Rakesh Kumar's case the services of petitioner may be regularized as well as eight years policy of H.P. Government alongwith other consequential service benefits *i.e.* back wages, arrear, compensation etc.

3. In amended reply to the claim petition the respondent has raised preliminary objections *qua* maintainability, *locus standi*, suppression of material facts, petition being barred by delay and laches and estoppel. On merits, it is submitted that as per available record the petitioner had worked *w.e.f.* April, 2000 to December, 2005 on muster roll basis and from 2006 to 2016 on bill basis as per availability of work and funds, thereafter the petitioner is still working on quotations/tender basis. It is asserted that as per mandays chart the petitioner has not completed 240 days in each calendar year. No fictional breaks were given to the petitioner, however the petitioner used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and convenience. It is asserted that due to act and conduct of the petitioner he could not complete 240 days in any calendar year. It is submitted that the record upto March, 2000 was gutted in fire. The petitioner has never approached the respondent department, moreover, no fictional breaks were given to the petitioner but petitioner worked intermittently and used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and convenience. It is asserted that as and when the petitioner approached the respondent department his services were utilized subject to availability of work and funds. It is asserted that the respondent department had regularized only those daily wagers who have fulfilled the criteria fixed under the regularization policy of daily wagers. It is asserted that Angat Kumar, Anil Kumar and Brij Lal were seniors to the applicant/petitioner. It is mentioned that the case of the petitioner is different and not covered under the judgments of Mool Raj Upadhayay's case and Rakesh Kumar's case. The petitioner had gainfully employed himself as an agriculturist. It is asserted that the petitioner was intermittent worker who used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and the question of violation of any of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not arise. Other averments made in the petition were denied and it is prayed that petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

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

1. Whether time to time termination of services of the petitioner during November, 1994 to January, 2016 by the respondent is violation of the provisions contained under the Act, as alleged? ..OPP (as amended).
2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative, to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to? ..OPP.
3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..OPR.
4. Whether the petitioner has no locus standi to file the present case, as alleged? ..OPR.
5. Whether the petitioner has not approached this Tribunal with clean hands and has suppressed the material facts, as alleged? ..OPR.

Relief.

6. In order to prove his case the petitioner has examined Shri Brij Lal s/o Sh. Nand Lal as PW1, Shri Mehar Singh s/o Sh. Gorakh Ram as PW2, Shri Nanak Chand s/o Shri Balak Ram as PW3 by way of examination-in-chief. Petitioner examined himself by way of affidavit as PW-4. He also produced on record documents *i.e.* copy of demand notice Ext. P-1 and copies of muster rolls Mark-A to Mark-H. The petitioner has also examined one Shri Kuldeep Chand, Dy. Range/Block Officer, Baldwara Range, Suket Forest Division Sunder Nagar, District Mandi as PW5 by way of examination-in-chief. He has also produced on record seniority list Ext. PW5/A, seniority list upto 31.12.2007 Ext. PW5/B, Mandays chart Ext. PW5/C, regularization order Ext. PW5/D, another regularization order Ext. PW5/F, regularization order Ext. PW5/G.

7. Respondent has examined Shri Rakesh Katoch, presently posted as Deputy Conservator of Forest, Suket Forest Division, Sundernagar by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein he reiterated the facts mentioned in the reply. He also produced on record copy of mandays chart Ext. RW1/B, copy of GD Entry Ext. RW1/C, copy of bills/sanctions & quotations Ext. RW1/D (169 pages).

8. I have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Assistant District Attorney for the respondent 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	: Yes
Issue No. 2	: Decided accordingly
Issue No. 3	: No
Issue No. 4	: No
Issue No. 5	: No
Relief.	: Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS**Issue No. 1**

10. The petitioner Sanjeev Kumar is asserted in his claim that he was engaged as daily waged forest worker by Forest Department in Suket Division under Forest Range Baldwara in January, 1993. He was intentionally granted fictional breaks despite request on his behalf and respondent allowed his juniors to complete 240 days of work in each calendar year. Respondent asserts that the petitioner was merely worked for few days since April, 2000 to December, 2005 on muster roll basis and from 2006 to 2016 on bill basis. He never worked continuously completing 240 days in a calendar year and that he was engaged on muster basis as well as bill basis.

11. The petitioner has examined various oral witnesses in order to prove that his employment with the respondent is continuous. PW1 Brij Lal has stated on oath that his house is located near forest nursery of the respondent and the petitioner is working there since the year 1998. He has expressed his ignorance to the suggestion that the petitioner was working on bill basis only. PW2 Shri Mehar Singh is forest worker since 1982. He states on oath that petitioner used to work during plantation and fencing season since 1993. According to him he saw petitioner working in Bhambla block and he (PW2) was regularized on 1.1.1998. He denied that petitioner used to work on bill basis only and according to him sometime on bill basis and sometime on muster roll basis. He also admits that before 2005 the petitioner was working on muster roll only. He denied that the petitioner was called only when the work was available but emphasized that the work was always available with the department. PW3 Shri Nanak Chand, Forest Mali has stated that petitioner was known to him and he worked in the forest department. He also worked with forest department. He supervised the work and also the work of petitioner. According to him petitioner had continuously worked with the department. He has denied that petitioner worked on bill basis in interval when the work was available however asserted that the petitioner has worked on muster roll basis as well as bill basis. Petitioner has submitted in his statement that he worked with the department from 1993 and also worked *w.e.f.* April, 2000 to December, 2005 on muster roll basis. From the year 2006 to 2016 petitioner worked on bill basis. He denied that he used to leave the work at his own sweet will and convenience. He denied that he was engaged only when the work and funds were available but asserted that work was available throughout the year. Contrary to the contention of the respondent that the petitioner worked in the year 2000 only, the muster rolls Ext. P1 to P8 which are admitted to be issued by the respondent department clearly show that the petitioner was initially appointed in April, 1995. Thereafter upto 1999 he has worked on muster roll basis at different intervals. The muster roll subsequent to the year 1999 upto 2016 is Ext. RW1/B along-with bills Ext. RW1/D (169 pages) depict that the petitioner is working on muster roll basis and bill basis continuously upto 2016. Though respondent has pleaded that vide rapat Ext. RW1/C record prior to year 2000 has been destroyed but a careful reading of mandays chart Ext. P1 to P8 shows that since 1995 petitioner was made to work on muster roll basis only upto 2000 and thereafter he was made to work alternatively on bill basis and muster basis clearly with a view to deprive benefits of continuous employment and completion of 240 days of work in a calendar year. It has been held by Hon'ble High Court of H.P. in **Ram Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others in CWP No.789 of 2024, decided on 4.7.2024** has observed in para nos. 5 and 6 as follows:—

- “5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is serving with the respondents Department since 2015 continuously by putting in more than 240 days in each calendar. It appears that in order to deny such kind of workmen, the benefits of regularization, respondent State has come with the nomenclature of “bill basis” but, fact of the matter still remains that be it a daily wager or a bill basis worker, he is serving the Department regularly putting in more than 240 days in each calendar.

6. This Court of the considered view that the distinction, which is now being created by the respondents Department between a daily wage worker and a bill base worker is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Be it a daily wage worker or a bill base worker, he is rendering the same service to the Department. Therefore, in the absence of their being any intelligible differentia between a daily wage worker and bill base worker, the classification that has been made by the Department cannot pass the touch stone of Article 14 of the Constitution of India”.

13. The respondent has miserably failed to controvert the contention of the petitioner that he had worked with respondent department since the year 1995 and continued to work till the year 2016. The contention of the respondent that the petitioner himself has not completed 240 days of work in a calendar year is not substantiated from any document/notice or other record produced by the respondent to show that they had offered work to the petitioner or issued any show cause notice when the petitioner did not appear for performance of his duties. There is nothing on record that there was non-availability of work and funds. No notification has been produced by the respondent show that the work in their department is primarily of seasonal nature. This contention of respondent is further falsified from the seniority list Ext. PW5/A and Ext. PW5/B which clearly shows that persons employed in the department during years subsequent deployment of the petitioner have been allowed to complete 240 days of work in a calendar year and also qualified for being regularized as per the policy of the government. The respondent has hence violated the basic fundamental rights of the petitioner and also the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act applicable to petitioner as a workman. No reason is stated as to why person employed subsequent to the petitioner was allowed to complete 240 days of work in a calendar year and petitioner was deprived of the similar benefits. The provisions of fictional breaks in service of the petitioner and the change of his service condition from muster roll basis/daily wages to bill basis without mandatory notice amounts to violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and unfair labour practices on the part of the respondent. In these circumstances since the department show that petitioner had starting work with the respondent since the year 1995, the time to time breaks in service of Sanjeev Kumar (petitioner) from the year 1995 to 2016 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not legal and justified. Issue no.1 is accordingly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issue No. 2

14. It has been proved from the evidence on the case file that the petitioner had started working with respondent since the year 1995 and continuously worked till 2016. The respondent has however failed to confirm the work charge status on the petitioner and other consequential benefits considering the length of his services. As described while deciding issue no.1 above the fictional breaks intentionally provided by respondent in the continuous service of the petitioner from 1995 onwards the period of fictional break is liable to be condoned. The petitioner is entitled for continuity in service, seniority and conferment of work charge status of regularization of service from the date of completion of 8 years *w.e.f.* initial appointment in the year 1995 with consequential benefits except back wages. The petitioner is entitled compensation to the tune of Rs.2 lakh along with interest 9% in lieu of back wages. Issue No. 2 is accordingly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issues No. 3, 4 and 5

15. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. The respondent has not been able to produce record pertaining to the actual employment of the petitioner since the year 1995 in a complete manner. The documents as well as oral statements of witnesses clearly points toward the fact that petitioner was in continued service with the respondent since the year 1995 with a period

of fictional breaks liable to be condoned. Thus the present claim is maintainable, petitioner has the *locus standi* to file the present claim petition and there are no evidence on record to show that the petitioner has suppressed the material facts from the court. Hence all these issues are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

16. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 5 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner shall be considered to be in a continuous service as daily wager from the year 1995 onwards. The petitioner is entitled for continuity in service, seniority and conferment of work charge status of regularization of service from the date of completion of 8 years *w.e.f.* initial appointment in the year 1995 with consequential benefits except back wages. The petitioner is entitled compensation to the tune of Rs. 2 lakh along-with interest 9% in lieu of back wages. Parties are left to bear their costs.

17. 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 28th day of February, 2025.

Sd/-
(Parveen Chauhan),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)

Reference No. : 01/2020
Date of Institution : 04.01.2020
Date of Decision : 28.02.2025

Shri Pawan Kumar s/o Shri Rup Lal, r/o Village Bharnal, P.O. Dhalwan, Tehsil Baldwara,
District Mandi, H.P. ...Petitioner.

Versus

The Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P.
...Respondent.

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

For the Petitioner : Sh. S.K. Sharma, Ld. Adv.
For Respondent : Ms. Shaveta Ji, Ld. ADA

AWARD

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

“Whether time to time termination of services of Shri Pawan Kumar s/o Shri RupLal, r/o Village Bharnal, P.O. Dhalwan, Tehsil Baldwara, District Mandi, H.P. by the Divisional Forest Officer, Suket Forest Division, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. during January, 2003 to June, 2015 and finally during July, 2015, without complying with the provisions of 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 employer?”

2. After receipt of above reference, a corrigendum reference dated 14th July, 2021 has been received from the appropriate government for adjudication which reads as follows:—

“Whereas, a reference has been made to the Ld. Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal, Kangra at Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P. *vide* notification of even no. dated 19-11-2019 for legal adjudication. However, inadvertently the correct facts could not be mentioned about the date of time to time termination of the workman in the said notification. Therefore, the date of time to time termination of the workman may be read as “January, 1997 to June, 2015” instead of “January, 2003 to June, 2015” as alleged by workman”.

3. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that the petitioner was engaged on daily waged forest worker by the forest department in its Suket Forest Division under Forest Range Baldwara in January, 1995 and the petitioner was granted fictional breaks by the department *w.e.f.* his initial engagement till 30.6.2015 and on 30.6.2015 the petitioner was wrongly and illegally retrenched/terminated by the department. However at the same time the department had allowed juniors to the petitioner to complete 240 days in each calendar year. While granting fictional breaks to the petitioner at the same time juniors to the petitioner namely Bhup Singh, Khem Singh, Roshan Lal, Piru Ram, Judhya Devi, Leela Dhar, Nand Lal, Jai Ram, Sita Devi, Jaiwanti, Vidya Sagar, Bego Ram, Duni Chand, Virender Kumr, Angat Kumar, Anil Kumar and Brij Lal were allowed to complete 240 days in each calendar year. During the said fictional breaks period the petitioner had requested the respondent department not to grant him fictional breaks but the respondent department lingered on the matter on one pretext or other and continuously granted fictional breaks to the petitioner since his initial engagement till date. The petitioner visited the office of respondent number of times and requested to count his fictional breaks period towards his seniority but the respondent lingered on the matter and finally refused to admit the claim of the petitioner. It is asserted that the services of many juniors to the petitioner had been regularized by the department, however the petitioner is entitled for regularization in terms of Mool Raj Upadhyay’s case since had he not granted fictional breaks in the year 1997 to the year 2015 he might have completed ten years of continuous service in January, 2007. It is asserted that the case of the petitioner also covered under judgment passed by Hon’ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh in CWP No. 2735/2010 titled as Rakesh Kumar vs. State of H.P. & Ors. decided on 28.7.2010 as well as eight years policy of the Government. It is further asserted that the petitioner was not gainfully employed during period of his fictional breaks. It is submitted that the petitioner is entitled for regularization from the date when his juniors were regularized. It is further submitted that after his final termination *w.e.f.* 30.6.2015 the petitioner had visited the office of respondent many times and requested for his re-engagement but of no avail. It is asserted that after termination of services of the petitioner he was not gainfully employed anywhere and he is unemployed till date having no source of income as well as his family is facing foods scarcity. It is prayed that the present claim petition may be allowed and fictional breaks granted to the petitioner since his initial engagement *i.e.* January, 1997 upto 30.6.2015 and hsi retrenchment/termination *w.e.f.* 30.6.2015 may be declared wrong, illegal and petitioner be reinstated forthwith along-with other consequential service benefits and period of fictional breaks may be counted towards the seniority and continuity in service of the petitioner. It is also prayed that as per Rakesh Kumar’s case or as per eight years

policy of the Government or from the date of regularization of juniors along-with back wages, arrears, compensation etc.

3. In reply to the claim petition the respondent has raised preliminary objections qua maintainability, *locus standi*, suppression of material facts, petition being barred by delay and laches and estoppel. On merits, it is submitted that as per available record the petitioner had presented himself for work to the concerned Beat Forest Guard, Baldwara Forest Range for available works/fund during January, 2003 as per record available and had worked intermittently with the respondent department upto 6/2015. It is denied that the applicant/petitioner was engaged as daily wage forest worker from January, 1997. It is asserted that as per mandays chart the petitioner has not completed 240 days in each calendar year. No fictional breaks were given to the petitioner, however the petitioner used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and convenience. It is asserted that due to act and conduct of the petitioner he could not complete 240 days in any calendar year. It is denied that juniors to the petitioner were allowed to complete 240 days in each calendar year. It is submitted that the record upto March, 2000 was gutted in fire. The petitioner has never approached the respondent department, moreover, no fictional breaks were given to the petitioner but petitioner worked intermittently and used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and convenience. It is asserted that as and when the petitioner approached the respondent department his services were utilized subject to availability of work and funds. It is asserted that the respondent department had regularized only those daily wagers who have fulfilled the criteria fixed under the regularization policy of daily wagers. No fictional breaks were given to the petitioner however the petitioner had left the work at his own sweet will and convenience. It is mentioned that the case of the petitioner is not covered under the judgment of Rakesh Kumar's case. The petitioner had gainfully employed himself as an agriculturist. It is asserted that the petitioner had intermittently worked who used to come and leave the work at his own sweet will and the question of violation of any of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not arise. Other averments made in the petition were denied and it is prayed that petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

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

1. Whether time to time termination of services of the petitioner during January, 1997 to June, 2015 and finally during July, 2015 by the respondent is violation of the provisions contained under the Act, 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 no *locus standi* to file the present case, as alleged? ..OPR.
5. Whether the petitioner has not come to this Court with clean hands and has suppressed the material facts, as alleged? ..OPR.
6. Whether the claim petition is barred by delay and laches, as alleged? ..OPR.

Relief.

6. In order to prove his case the petitioner has examined Shri Pawan Kumar s/o Shri Srikrishan as PW1, Shri Mehar Singh s/o Shri Gorakh Ram as PW2, Shri Nanak Chand s/o Shri Balak Ram as PW3 by way of examination-in-chief. Petitioner examined himself by way of affidavit as PW-4. He also produced on record documents *i.e.* copy of demand notice Ext. P-1 and copies of muster rolls Mark-A and Mark-B. The petitioner has also examined one Shri Kuldeep Chand, Dy. Range/Block Officer, Baldwara Range, Suket Forest Division Sunder Nagar, District Mandi as PW5 by way of examination-in-chief. He has also produced on record seniority list Ext. PW5/A, seniority list upto 31.12.2007 Ext. PW5/B, Mandays chart Ext. PW5/C, regularization order Ext. PW5/D, another regularization order Ext. PW5/F, regularization order Ext. PW5/G.

7. Respondent has examined Shri Rakesh Katoch, presently posted as Deputy Conservator of Forest, Suket Forest Division, Sundernagar by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein he reiterated the facts mentioned in the reply. He also produced on record mandays chart Ext. RW1/B, copy of GD entry Ext. RW1/C, copy of loss report Ext. RW1/D, copy of mandays chart of Pawan Kumar Ext. RW1/E and copy of bills/sanctions and quotations Ext. RW1/F.

8. I have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Assistant District Attorney for the respondent 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	: Yes
Issue No. 2	: Decided accordingly
Issue No. 3	: No
Issue No. 4	: No
Issue No. 5	: No
Relief.	: Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1

10. The petitioner Pawan Kumar has asserted in his claim that he was engaged as daily rated forest worker by Forest Department in Suket Division under Forest Range Baldwara in January, 1993. He was intentionally granted fictional breaks despite request on his behalf and respondent allowed his juniors to complete 240 days of work in each calendar year. Respondent asserts that the petitioner was merely worked for few days since January, 2003 to 2015. He never worked continuously completing 240 days in a calendar year and that he was engaged on muster basis as well as bill basis.

11. PW1 Pawan Kumar s/o Shri Srikrishan has deposed on oath that he is shopkeeper having a shop at Dhalwan. He states that petitioner had worked in guardkhana in the office of forest guard from 1997 to 2015 doing plantation work. He has shown his ignorance to the suggestion that petitioner had merely worked on bill basis. PW2 Shri Mehar Singh is forest worker in Baldwara range since 1982. He states that petitioner used to work during plantation and fencing season since 1997. He personally saw the petitioner working at Bhambla block. According to him he had seen the petitioner working regularly from 1.1.1998 till date. He denied that petitioner worked only on bill basis but asserts that petitioner worked on bill basis as well as muster roll basis. He admits that before year 2005 petitioner worked on muster roll basis and thereafter on bill basis. He has denied that petitioner was called by respondent only when the work and funds were available but he has

added that the work was always available with the respondent. Similarly PW3 Shri Nanak Chand, forest mali also stated that the petitioner used to work in forest department continuously. He also states that the petitioner worked on muster roll basis as well as bill basis. The petitioner Pawan Kumar in his statement has mentioned that he was engaged in the year 1997 and continuously worked with the respondent till 2015. He denied that he was not given fictional breaks by the respondent. He also denied that he used to leave the work at his convenience and was engaged only when the work and funds were available.

12. Contrary to the contention of the respondent that petitioner was engaged in the year 2003 the muster roll Ext. P1 for February, 1998 and Ext. P2 for March, 1998 alongwith muster rolls Ext. RW1/B from the year 2003 to 2015 depict the employment of petitioner since the year 1998. These documents *i.e.* muster rolls and bills upto 2015 depict that the petitioner had been working continuously till 2015. The record of muster roll before the year 2000 is alleged to be burnt in the fire vide Ext. RW1/C and Ext. RW1/D however the mandays chart Ext. P1 pertaining to February, 1998 and Ext. P2 pertaining to March 1998 have not been disputed by the respondent which clearly indicates that initially the petitioner was put to work by the respondent in February, 1997. It has been held by Hon'ble High Court of H.P. in **Ram Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others in CWP No.789 of 2024, decided on 4.7.2024** has observed in para nos. 5 and 6 as follows:—

“5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is serving with the respondents-Department since 2015 continuously by putting in more than 240 days in each calendar. It appears that in order to deny such kind of workmen, the benefits of regularization, respondent-State has come with the nomenclature of “bill basis” but, fact of the matter still remains that be it a daily wager or a bill basis worker, he is serving the Department regularly putting in more than 240 days in each calendar.

6. This Court of the considered view that the distinction, which is now being created by the respondents Department between a daily wage worker and a bill base worker is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Be it a daily wage worker or a bill base worker, he is rendering the same service to the Department. Therefore, in the absence of their being any intelligible differentia between a daily wage worker and bill base worker, the classification that has been made by the Department cannot pass the touch stone of Article 14 of the Constitution of India”.

13. The respondent has miserably failed to controvert the contention of the petitioner that he had worked with respondent department since February 1998 and continued to work till the year 2015. The contention of the respondent that the petitioner himself has not completed 240 days of work in a calendar year is not substantiated from any document/notice or other record produced by the respondent to show that they had offered work to the petitioner or issued any show cause notice when the petitioner did not appear for performance of his duties. There is nothing on record that there was non availability of work and funds. No notification has been produced by the respondent show that the work in their department is primarily of seasonal nature. This contention of respondent is further falsified from the seniority list Ext. PW5/A and Ext. PW5/B which clearly shows that persons employed in the department during years subsequent to deployment of the petitioner have been allowed to complete 240 days of work in a calendar year and also qualified for being regularized as per the policy of the government. The respondent has hence violated the basic fundamental rights of the petitioner and also the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act applicable to petitioner as a workman. No reason is stated as to why person employed subsequent to the petitioner allowed to complete 240 days of work in a calendar year and petitioner was deprived of the similar benefits. The provisions of fictional breaks in service of the petitioner and the change of his service condition from muster roll basis/daily wages to bill basis without

mandatory notice amounts to violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and unfair labour practices on the part of the respondent. In these circumstances since the record of department show that petitioner had starting work with the respondent since February, 1997, the time to time breaks in service of Pawan Kumar (petitioner) from the year February, 1997 to June, 2015 and finally terminated in July, 2015 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not legal and justified. Issue no.1 is accordingly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issue No. 2

14. It has been proved from the evidence on the case file that the petitioner had started working with respondent since February, 1998 and continuously worked till 2015. The respondent has however failed to confirm the work charge status on the petitioner and other consequential benefits considering the length of his services. As described while deciding issue no.1 above the fictional breaks intentionally provided by respondent in the continuous service of the petitioner from 1998 onwards the period of fictional break is liable to be condoned. The petitioner is entitled for reinstatement in service along-with continuity in service, seniority and conferment of work charge status of regularization of service from the date of completion of 8 years *w.e.f.* initial appointment i.e. February, 1998 with consequential benefits except back wages. The petitioner is entitled compensation to the tune of Rs. 2 lakh along with interest 9% in lieu of back wages. Issue No.2 is accordingly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issues No. 3, 4 and 5

15. The onus of proving these issues on the respondent. The respondent has not been able to produce on records pertaining to the actual employment of the petitioner since the year 1998 in a complete manner. The documents as well as oral statements of witnesses clearly points toward the fact that petitioner was continued in service with the respondent since the year 1998 with a period of fictional breaks liable to be condoned. Thus the present claim is maintainable, petitioner has the *locus standi* to file the present claim petition and there are no evidence on record to show that the petitioner has suppressed the material facts from the court. Hence all these issues are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

RELIEF

16. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 5 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner shall be considered to be in a continuous service as daily wager from February, 1998 onwards. The petitioner is entitled for reinstatement in service along-with continuity in service, seniority and conferment of work charge status of regularization of service from the date of completion of 8 years *w.e.f.* initial appointment i.e. February, 1998 with consequential benefits except back wages. The petitioner is entitled compensation to the tune of Rs.2 lakh along with interest 9% in lieu of back wages. Parties are left to bear their costs.

17. 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 28th day of February, 2025.

Sd/-
(Parveen Chauhan)
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,
Kangra at Dharamshala, H.P.

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

Reference No. : 11/2023
Date of Institution : 25.3.2023
Date of Decision : 28.02.2025

1. Shri Vyas Dev s/o Shri Chain Lal, r/o Village Bhakanu, P.O. Jhulara, Tehsil & District Chamba, H.P.
2. Shri Chaman Singh s/o Alam Ram, r/o Village Sukretha, P.O. Jhulara, Tehsil & District Chamba, H.P.
3. Shri Sanju s/o Shri Chatro, r/o Village Bhatka, P.O. Jhulara, Tehsil & District Chamba, H.P.
..Petitioners.

Versus

The Divisional Forest Officer, Forest Division Chamba, District Chamba, H.P.

..Respondent.

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

For the Petitioner(s) : Sh. O.P. Bhardwaj, Ld. Adv.

For Respondent : Sh. D.K. Thakur, Ld. ADA

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 action of the employer *i.e.* the Divisional Forest Officer, Forest Division Chamba, District Chamba, H.P. to give fictional breaks in services to workmen from time to time, to change their service conditions from daily wage workers to bill basis during the year, 2014 to till the date of raising demand notice by the workmen (1) Shri Vyas Dev s/o Shri Chain Lal, r/o Village Bhakanu, P.O. Jhulara, Tehsil & District Chamba, H.P. (2) Shri Chaman Singh s/o Shri Alam Singh, r/o Village Sukretha, P.O. Jhulara, Tehsil & District Chamba, H.P. (3) Shri Sanju s/o Shri Chatro, r/o Village Bhatka, P.O. Jhulara, Tehsil & District Chamba, H.P., without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged by the workmen, is legal and justified? If not, from which date what relief of seniority, regularization of services and past service benefits above aggrieved workmen are entitled to as per demand notice dated nil and rejoinder dated 27-01-2022 (copies enclosed) from the above employer?”

2. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that petitioner no.1 was engaged on daily wages basis worker on muster roll since the year 2011 by the respondent whereas petitioners no. 2 and 3 were engaged by respondent department on daily wages basis workers on muster roll in the month of June, 2013 in Forest Range Masroond under Forest Division Chamba and continuously worked with the respondent department. In between the services of the petitioners

were engaged and disengaged and given fictional breaks from time to time not to complete 240 days in each calendar year as well as for the purpose of regularization whereas the services of the persons engaged with the petitioner were retained continuously in the department. It is asserted that during year 2014 service conditions of the petitioners were changed by the respondent department from daily wager workers to bill basis without serving any notice upon the petitioners under Section 9-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short), however the service conditions of the petitioners were not only changed but also changed the period and mode of payment by the respondent department. It is asserted that the respondent not only violated the specific provisions of the Act in the case of the petitioners but also ignored the Notification No. FFE-B-C(1)-35/2009 Shimla-2 issued by the Government of H.P. regarding engaging of workers on muster rolls even after introduction of bill basis system. The bill basis system was introduced in all the Divisions of District Chamba in the year 2015-16 but in the case of petitioners the condition was violated by the respondent. According to petitioner they are entitled to be issued muster roll as they continued as daily wager at the time when system was introduced in District Chamba. Thus total period of their service was to be treated as on muster roll basis for the purpose of completion of 240 days in a calendar year. According to petitioners, respondent by their act and conduct has snatched the opportunity of petitioner for getting benefit of regularization within a period of 8 years as per policy of Government which amounts to unfair labour practice under the provisions of the Act. The petitioners allege that they are entitled for back wages, seniority, past service benefits and regularization as per policy of the State Government and as per common judgment of Hon'ble High Court of H.P. in CWP No. 2735 of 2010 decided on 28.7.2010 titled as Rakesh Kumar vs. State of H.P. It is alleged that respondent has regularized the services of persons junior to the petitioners who were engaged on muster roll basis after petitioners. This action of respondent in respect of the petitioners was highly unjustified. The respondent has also violated the principle of 'last come first go' as person junior to the petitioner have been retained continuously without any breaks and also granted the benefits of regularization. The petitioners have mentioned the names of the workers in the petition whose services have been regularized by the respondent department. According to petitioners they never remained close for work since the years 2011 and 2013 but the respondent has intentionally given fictional breaks without any fault on the part of the petitioners despite availability of work. Had the services of the petitioners not been interrupted by giving artificial/fictional breaks they would have completed 8 years of continuous services as on 31.12.2019 and 31.12.2021 would have become entitled for regularization of their daily wage services after completion of 8 years of service. The petitioners would have also been entitled for work charge/regularization as the common judgment of Hon'ble High Court titled as Rakesh Kumar vs. State of H.P. It is alleged that the respondent had committed gross violation of statutory provisions of the Act, notification/instructions as envisaged under Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India. In view of the above facts and circumstances the petitioners have prayed that the period of intermittent fictional breaks given to the petitioner by the respondent during their entire service period may be counted towards the calculation of continuous service of 240 days in each calendar year. It is also prayed that the services of the petitioners may be regularized under 8 years of regularization policy along-with back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation from the respondent department.

3. In reply to the claim petition the respondent has raised preliminary objections qua maintainability and suppression of material facts. On merits, it is submitted that the forestry work was seasonal in nature and subject to availability of funds. It is asserted that petitioners no.1 to 3 were engaged in the month of December, 2012, August, 2014 and in the year 2013 respectively as a mazdoor carrying out seasonal forestry works in Masroond Range at Chamba Forest Division. The petitioners have done work on bill basis. It is further submitted that initially the petitioners were engaged as mazdoor to carry out seasonal forestry works in the year 2012, 2013 and 2014 and they had never completed 240 days in any calendar year in Masroond Range. It is submitted that as per Government instruction No.Ft. A-1-87 (ALM)/Contract dated 18.10.2007, HP Government

notification No. FFE-B-C(1)-35/2009 dated 28.4.2009 and ACS Forest notification no. FFE-A(6)2-16/2015 dated 12.6.2017 all the works were to be carried out on tender basis and as such forest department now do not engage any labourer either on muster roll basis or by way of any other means not approved by the notifications. It is asserted that works were to be carried out on bill basis and the payment was to be made as per work carried out on schedule rates and not on day wage basis. The respondent has never changed the services conditions of the petitioners. It was further submitted that the petitioners since 2015 executed work on bill basis with the department as petty contractor as per availability of works in the department. It is further denied that the services of the petitioners were illegally disengaged/ engaged by the respondent department and given fictional breaks from time to time. It is asserted that in accordance with the latest policy of the Government of H.P. services of those daily wagers who have completed required 240 days in each calendar year were regularized subject to availability of vacant sanctioned post and as per seniority from prospective effect. It is submitted that the petitioners had not completed 240 days in the preceding 12 months and as such there was no violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. However the services of the petitioners were not terminated by the respondent and there was no violation of principle of 'last come first go' as embodied under Section 25-G of the Act. It is submitted that neither any junior was retained nor engaged by the respondent and the provisions of Sections 25-G and 25-H of the Act were not violated by the respondent. It is further submitted that petitioners were engaged as casual labour for seasonal work against the sanctioned post and they are not entitled for regularization of their services. It is submitted that no junior labourer had been regularized in service by the respondent. Other averments made in the petition were denied and it is prayed that petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

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

1. Whether the action of the employer/respondent to give fictional breaks in services to workmen from time to time to change their service conditions from daily wage workers to bill basis during the year, 2014 to till the date of raising demand notice by the workman without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is/was illegal and unjustified, as alleged? ...OPP (corrected as on).
2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the petitioners are entitled to seniority, regularization of services and past service benefits, as alleged? ...OPP.
3. Whether the petition is not maintainable, as alleged?

OPR

4. Whether the petitioners have not come to the Court with clean hands and have suppressed the material facts, as alleged? ...OPR.

Relief.

6. In order to prove his case the petitioner No.1 Vyas Dev has produced on record his affidavit Ext.PW1/A wherein he reiterated the fact stated in the petition. He also produced on record copy of demand notice Ext. PA, copy of reply to demand notice Ex PB, copy of rejoinder Ex PC, copy of report of conciliation Ex PD, copy of mandays chart of Giano and Kishnu Ex. PE & Ex. PF, copy of statement of account of Vyas Dev Ex PG, copy of certificate Ex PH, copy of

mandays of Chaman Ex PJ, copy of certificate Ex PK, copy of mandays of Sanju Ex. PL, copy of casual card Ex. PM, copy of account statement of Sanju Ex. PN and copy of daily attendance Ex. PO1 to Ex. PO13. Petitioners no.2 and 3 namely Chaman Singh and Sanju in order prove their case have produced on record their affidavits Ext. PW2/A and Ext.PW3/A.

7. Respondent has examined Shri Kritagya Kumar, IFS, presently working as Divisional Forest Officer, Chamba Forest Division by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein he reiterated the facts mentioned in the reply. He also produced on record mandays chart of petitioner Ext.RW1/B, mandays chart of Sh. Chaman Singh Ext. RW1/C, mandays chart of Sanju Ext. RW1/D, notification dated 18.10.2007 Ext. RW1/E, notification dated 23.4.2009 Ext. RW1/F, notification dated 12 June, 2017 Ext. RW1/G and copy of summary of bills Ext. RW1/H.

8. I have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Assistant District Attorney for the respondent 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	:Yes
Issue No. 2	: Decided accordingly.
Issue No. 3	: No
Issue No. 4	: No
Relief.	: Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1

10. A joint statement of claim have been filed by the petitioners in this case. Petitioners have alleged that they were engaged as daily wagers by the respondent in the years 2011, 2013 and 2014 respectively and since then each of them have continuously worked with the respondent department. The work being done by them was not properly reflected in the documents prepared by the respondent department. They were intentionally not allowed to complete 240 days and time to time fictional breaks were given to them. On the other hand workmen employed after the petitioners were shown to be continuously employed and also regularized in the course of time. The mode of payment was changed from muster roll basis to bill basis without any notice. They had pleaded that work was intentionally not given to them even when they were willing to work. It is also alleged that respondent has deliberately not provided attendance record of the workers. The petitioners have also denied that work of the respondent department was seasonal in nature. They denied that department is getting all the work done on bill basis only. They also denied that they had not turned for work out of their own sweet will.

11. On the contrary RW1 Shri Kritagya Kumar, Divisional Forest Officer, Chamba has deposed that the petitioners have been doing all the work on bill basis only. According to him petitioners have never completed 240 days of work in any calendar year. It is also mentioned by him that vide government notification forest department does not engage any labourers on muster roll basis as all the work is to be done on contract basis and on schedule rate basis. He has denied that the services conditions of petitioner were changed or they were given illegal fictional breaks from time to time. In his cross-examination he has denied that the services of the petitioners were engaged during year 2012, 2013 on daily wage basis and since then they are continuously working with the respondent department. He has emphasized that petitioners have been working

intermittently on seasonal basis. He admitted that there is no notification qua classification of certain works of forest as seasonal in nature. He admits that at the time change of service conditions of the petitioners from muster roll basis to bill basis no notice was given to them.

12. The mandays chart of petitioner Vyas Dev is Ext. RW1/B from the year 2012 to 2021. He is shown to have been worked on daily wage basis in 2012, 2013 and 2014 with a good amount of mandays reflected subsequently in the year 2014. In 2015 he is shown to have worked on bill basis as well as muster roll basis. Subsequently since the year 2016 he is shown to be working continuously almost on each month on bill basis but no mandays have been reflected.

13. Ext. RW1/C is the mandays of petitioner Shri Chaman Singh from the year 2014 till 2021 where mandays have been reflected only till January, 2015. Thereafter he is shown to be working almost throughout each year on bill basis mandays whereof have not been mentioned.

14. Ext. RW1/D is the mandays of petitioner Sanju from the year 2013 till 2021 where mandays from June 2013 till January, 2015 have been reflected. Thereafter the petitioner is shown to be working on bill basis without record of mandays.

15. The respondent has heavily relied upon the notification Ext. RW1/F and Ext. RW1/G. As per notification Ext. RW1/F point no.1 reads as follows:

“1) All works of Forest Department should be done on bill basis except where already continuing daily wagers are involved, who are working for last many years and cannot be removed. In such cases Muster Roll may be issued with the prior approval/authorization of DFO Concerned”.

16. Both the notifications were with regard to employment of new daily wagers only. It is the contention of the respondent that the work was being done on contract/bill basis and on the other hand they submitted work was seasonal in nature. In this regard it is important to peruse the provisions of The Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition Act) 1970, Section 1 Clause 5 (a) and (b) which reads as follows:—

“(1) This Act may be called the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970.

(2) It extends to the whole of India.

(3) It shall come into force on such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint and different dates may be appointed for different provisions of this Act.

(4) It applies—(a) to every establishment in which twenty or more workmen are employed or were employed on any day of the preceding twelve months as contract labour; (b) to every contractor who employs or who employed on any day of the preceding twelve months twenty or more workmen: Provided that the appropriate Government may, after giving not less than two months' notice of its intention so to do, by notification in the Official Gazette, apply the provisions of this Act to any establishment or contractor employing such number of workmen less than twenty as may be specified in the notification.

(5) (a) It shall not apply to establishments in which work only of an intermittent or casual nature is performed.

- (b) If a question arises whether work performed in an establishment is of an intermittent or casual nature, the appropriate Government shall decide that question after consultation with Central Board or, as the case may be, a State Board, and its decision shall be final. Explanation.—

For the purpose of this sub-section, work performed in an establishment shall not be deemed to be of an intermittent nature—

- (i) if it was performed for more than one hundred and twenty days in the preceding twelve months, or
- (ii) if it is of a seasonal character and is performed for more than sixty days in a year”.

17. The record of the work done by the petitioners show that they were already on muster roll basis when their condition of service was changed on bill basis and also mandatory notice under Section 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act. This was not only the violation of produced notifications Ext. RW1/F and Ext. RW1/G but against the basic principle of the Industrial Disputes Act. This amounted to temporary employment of petitioners despite no proof of seasonal work. The mandays chart reflected that petitioners have been working for maximum months in a year. Despite this they were being deprived of benefits of continuous service deliberately by showing them to have worked on bill basis only. It has been held by Hon’ble High Court of H.P. in **Ram Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others in CWP No.789 of 2024, decided on 4.7.2024** has observed in para nos. 5 and 6 as follows:—

- “5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is serving with the respondents-Department since 2015 continuously by putting in more than 240 days in each calendar. It appears that in order to deny such kind of workmen, the benefits of regularization, respondent-State has come with the nomenclature of “bill basis” but, fact of the matter still remains that be it a daily wager or a bill basis worker, he is serving the Department regularly putting in more than 240 days in each calendar.
6. This Court of the considered view that the distinction, which is now being created by the respondents- Department between a daily wage worker and a bill base worker is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Be it a daily wage worker or a bill base worker, he is rendering the same service to the Department. Therefore, in the absence of their being any intelligible differentia between a daily wage worker and bill base worker, the classification that has been made by the Department cannot pass the touch stone of Article 14 of the Constitution of India”.

18. Considering the above law of Hon’ble High Court of H.P. the change in service condition of the employment of petitioners without notice was illegal on part of respondent. The respondent caused deliberate break in services of petitioners. There is no evidence to prove that the petitioners had ever absented themselves from the work or any notice was issued by the respondent directing them to join the work. The mode of payment of the petitioners were however abruptly changed to bill basis in clear violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

19. It is again the contention of the respondent by the learned Dy. D.A. for the State that the forest department does not confirm work charge status as per latest direction of government of Himachal Pradesh. The Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the directions issued by the Hon’ble High Court of H.P. in **CWPOA Nos.7438,7505, 7509, 7513, 7517, 7518, 7519, 7538,**

7574 and 7577 of 2020 titled as **Gopal Singh & Ors vs. State of H.P. & Ors.** where the double Bench of Hon'ble High Court has laid down in paras no.11, 12, 13, 14 or 15 as follows:—

- “11. Civil Appeal No. 5753 of 2019, preferred by State in Ashwani Kumar's case has been dismissed by the Supreme Court on 22.07.2019.
12. It is well settled in various pronouncements of this High Court that for conferring Work Charge status on a daily waged worker on completion of requisite years, existence of work charge establishment in the Department is not necessary.
13. In this regard, it is apt to record that in Mool Raj Upadhyaya vs. State of H.P. and others, 1994 Supp. (2) SCC 316, an affidavit was filed by the Chief Secretary to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, formulating a Scheme for granting work-charged status to all daily-waged employees, serving in the State of Himachal Pradesh, in all Departments, irrespective of the fact that Department is/was having work-charged establishment or not.
14. Term "work-charge" in Himachal Pradesh is used in different context, than work-charge status in other States. A person working on daily-waged basis, before his regularization, is granted work-charged status on connected matters (2024: HHC: 7742) completion of specified number of years as daily-wager and effect thereof is that thereafter non-completion of 240 days in a calendar year would not result into his ouster from the service or debar him from getting the benefit of length of service for that particular year. Normally, work-charged status is conferred upon a daily-wager, on accrual of his right for regularization, on completion of prescribed period of service, but non regularization is for want of regular vacancy in the department or for any other just and valid reason. Therefore, it is a period daily-wage service and regularization, which is interregnum altogether different form the temporary establishment of work-charge, as discussed in the judgment of the Apex Court relied upon by the State and, for practice in Himachal Pradesh, work-charged status is not conferred upon the person employed in a project but upon such daily-wage workers, who are to be continued after particular length of service for availability of work but without regularization for want of creation of post by Government for his regularization/ regular appointment. Therefore, work is always available in such cases and the charge of a daily-wager is created thereon to avoid his disengagement for reasons upon which a daily-wager can be dispensed with from service.
15. On conferment of work-charged status, sword of disengagement, hanging on the neck of workmen, is removed on completion of specified period of daily-waged service, as thereafter instead of daily-wage, the employee would get regular pay-scale and would be entitled to other consequential benefits for which a daily-waged employee is not entitled”.
20. Thus at present in the conferment of work charge status work charge establishment in the department is not pre-requisite. The evidence on the case file would clearly show that by illegal action of the respondent the petitioners were given intentional breaks in their services which amounted to change in their service condition from daily wager to bill basis without following the mandatory procedure of law, hence issue no. 1 is decided in the favour of the petitioners. The respondent also caused intentional break in service of petitioners despite availability of work.

Issue No. 2

21. It has been proved from the evidence on the case file that the petitioners had started working with respondent since the years 2012, 2013 and 2014 respectively and continuously worked till date. The respondent has however failed to confirm the work charge status on the petitioners and other consequential benefits considering the length of their services. As described while deciding issue no.1 above the period of fictional breaks intentionally provided by respondent in the continuous service of the petitioners from the years 2012, 2013 and 2014 onwards respectively is liable to be condoned. The petitioners are entitled for continuity in service, seniority and conferment of work charge status of regularization of service from the date of completion of 8 years from their initial appointment i.e. years 2012, 2013 and 2014 respectively with consequential benefits except back wages. Issue No.2 is accordingly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

Issues No. 3 and 4

22. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. Nothing appears from the pleadings of the parties as well as evidence produced on record to show that the petitioners have suppressed the material facts from this court and not come to the court with clean hands. As per mandays produced before this court they are still continuously working with the department. Accordingly issues no. 3 and 4 are decided in the favour of the petitioner and the claim petition is maintainable.

RELIEF

23. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 6 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner shall be considered to be in a continuous service as daily wager from their initial appointment onwards. They are held entitled for all the consequential benefits including regularization as per policy of the Government from the date of their juniors have been regularized by the department without back wages. Parties are left to bear their costs.

24. 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 28th day of February, 2025.

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

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT**NOTIFICATION**

Shimla-2, the 2nd May, 2025

No. TPT-B(2)-6/2019-II.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the transfer of Shri Ram Prakash, Regional Transport Officer from Regional Transport Office

Chamba, Distt. Chamba, to Regional Transport Office Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur, against vacant post, with immediate effect, on administrative grounds, in public interest with TTA/JT.

Sd/-

Addl. Chief Secretary (Transport).

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 2nd May, 2025

No. TPT-B(2)-6/2019-II.—In continuation to this department's notifications of even number dated 24-02-2025, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order posting of the following Regional Transport Officer (Class-I Gazetted) (Non-HAS) at the places shown against their names with immediate effect, in public interest, as under:—

Sl. No.	Name of Official	Present place of posting	Place of Posting
1.	Sh. Naresh Chand Verma	On Promotion	Regional Transport Office Kinnaur at Rampur.
2.	Sh. Vipin Gupta (Officiating RTO)	On Promotion	Regional Transport Office Nalagarh at Baddi.

The above officers are requested to submit their joining reports immediately.

Sd/-

Addl. Chief Secretary (Transport).

STATE AUDIT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Dated: 2nd May, 2025

No. 1-315/76-Fin. (LA) Vol-10-2586.—On the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the promotions of following Junior Auditors, Group-B (Non-Gazetted) in the Pay Level-11 to the post of Section Officer, Group-B (Gazetted) in the Pay Level-13, with immediate effect:—

Sl. No.	Name of the Junior Auditor
1.	Sh. Maharaj Singh
2.	Sh. Pankaj Bhararia
3.	Sh. Kamal
4.	Sh. Vinod Kumar

5.	Sh. Bir Singh
6.	Sh. Pawan Kumar
7.	Sh. Shiv Kumar
8.	Ms. Reena Devi
9.	Sh. Abhishek Kumar
10.	Sh. Mahesh Kumar Kashyap
11.	Sh. Divijay
12.	Sh. Arvind Kumar

2. The above officers may submit their options for fixation of pay under Rule FR-22 (1) (a) (i) within one month from the date of issue of this notification.

3. Consequent upon the above promotions, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the following postings and transfers:—

Sl. No.	Name of the official	From	To
1.	Sh. Jeewan Kumar, Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra.	Audit Circle, Una with Headquarter at Una against the vacant post of Section Officer.
2.	Sh. Maharaj Singh, on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra.	Audit Circle, Bilaspur with Headquarter at Bilaspur against the vacant post of Section Officer.
3.	Sh. Pankaj Bhararia, on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla against the vacant post of Section Officer.
4.	Sh. Kamal, on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla against the vacant post of Section Officer.
5.	Sh. Vinod Kumar, on promotion as Section Officer.	Headquarter Office, H.P. State Audit Department, Shimla-9.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra against the post of Section Officer to be vacated by the officer at Sl. No. 1 above.
6.	Sh. Bir Singh, on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra.	Audit Circle, Hamirpur with Headquarter at Hamirpur against the vacant post of Section Officer.
7.	Sh. Pawan Kumar, on promotion as Section Officer.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla against the vacant post of Section Officer.
8.	Sh. Shiv Kumar on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, Sardar Patel University, Mandi.	Audit Circle, Kangra with Headquarter at Dharamshala against the vacant post of Section Officer.

9.	Ms. Reena Devi, on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. University, Summer Hill, Shimla.	Liaison Office of H.P. Board of School Education, Shimla at Sanjauli against the vacant post of Section Officer.
10.	Sh. Abhishek Kumar, on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra.	Audit Circle, Dehra with headquarter at Jawalamukhi against the vacant post of Section Officer.
11.	Sh. Mahesh Kumar Kashyap, on promotion as Section Officer.	Headquarter Office, H.P. State Audit Department, Shimla-9.	Headquarter Office, H.P. State Audit Department, Shimla-9 against the vacant post of Section Officer (Technical).
12.	Sh. Divijay, on promotion as Section Officer.	Headquarter Office, H.P. State Audit Department, Shimla-9.	Directorate of Prisons & Correctional Services, Himachal Pradesh against the vacant post of Section Officer (State Audit Department) by relieving Shri Ram Sunil, Assistant Director of this additional charge.
13.	Sh. Arvind Kumar, on promotion as Section Officer.	Resident Audit Scheme, Dr. Y.S. Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Nauni, Solan.	Department of State Taxes and Excise, Himachal Pradesh at Shimla-9 against the vacant post of Section Officer.
14.	Sh. Ajay Kumar, Junior Auditor.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra against the post of Junior Auditor to be vacated by the official at Sl. No. 2 above.
15.	Sh. Daljeet Kumar, Junior Auditor.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla.	Resident Audit Scheme, Sardar Patel University, Mandi against the post of Junior Auditor to be vacated by the official at Sl. No. 8 above.
16.	Sh. Manmohan Sharma, Junior Auditor.	Audit Circle, Dehra with Headquarter at Jawalamukhi.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra against the post of Junior Auditor to be vacated by the official at Sl. No. 3 above.
17.	Sh. Deepak Singh Pathania, Junior Auditor.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla.	Resident Audit Scheme, H.P. Board of School Education, Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra against the post of Junior Auditor to be vacated by the official at Sl. No. 4 above.

18.	Sh. Banish Kumar, Junior Auditor.	For audit of various institutions with Headquarter at Shimla.	Resident Audit Scheme, Dr. Y.S. Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Nauni, Solan against the post of Junior Auditor to be vacated by the official at Sl. No. 13 above.
-----	--------------------------------------	---	---

4. No TTA & Joining time will be admissible to the above officials except Sl. No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 16 and 17.

By order,

Sd/-

Principal Secretary (Finance).

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवम् तहसीलदार, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी,
जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

श्री प्यारे लाल पुत्री सीता राम, निवासी टीका ढांगू, डाकघर बारीं मंदिर, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

यह दरखास्त श्री प्यारे लाल पुत्र श्री सीता राम, निवासी टीका ढांगू, डाकघर बारीं मंदिर, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने समस्त रिकार्ड व शपथ-पत्र सहित इस कार्यालय में दायर की है, जिसमें उल्लेख है कि उसके भाई रूप लाल पुत्र मरचू राम की मृत्यु दिनांक 27-03-2024 को हुई है परन्तु किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत सिकांदर के रिकार्ड में उक्त मृत्यु का पंजीकरण दिनांक 27-03-2024 दर्ज न हो सका। प्रार्थी अब मृत्यु दिनांक उपरोक्त को ग्राम पंचायत सिकांदर में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री रूप लाल पुत्र मरचू राम, निवासी टीका ढांगू, डाकघर बारीं मंदिर, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) की मृत्यु तिथि 27-03-2024 को ग्राम पंचायत सिकांदर के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 08-05-2025 तक असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर न्यायालय होकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही की जाएगी। उसके बाद का उजर जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 10-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकार एवं तहसीलदार,
बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवम् तहसीलदार, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी,
जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)**

श्री राज कुमार पुत्र श्री बली राम, निवासी टीका टिक्करी, डाकघर समीरपुर, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

अतिरिक्त जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु हमीरपुर के कार्यालय पत्र संख्या HFW-HMR (ST-B&D) Delayed 2024/1-7369, दिनांक 25-03-2025 अनुसार श्री राज कुमार पुत्र श्री बली राम, निवासी टीका टिक्करी, डाकघर समीरपुर, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) का आवेदन समस्त रिकार्ड व शपथ-पत्र सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ है, जिसमें उल्लेख है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 25-05-1964 को हुआ परन्तु किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत पंजोत के रिकार्ड में उक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण दिनांक 25-05-1964 को दर्ज न हो सका। प्रार्थी अब जन्म दिनांक उपरोक्त को ग्राम पंचायत पंजोत में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री राज कुमार पुत्र श्री बली राम, निवासी टीका टिक्करी, डाकघर समीरपुर, तहसील बमसन टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) की जन्म तिथि 25-05-1964 को ग्राम पंचायत पंजोत के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 08-05-2025 तक असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर न्यायालय होकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही की जाएगी। उसके बाद का उजर जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 10-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकार एवं तहसीलदार,
बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवम् तहसीलदार, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी,
जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)**

श्री राज कुमार पुत्र भागी राम, निवासी टीका भटेड, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

अतिरिक्त जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु हमीरपुर के कार्यालय पत्र संख्या HFW-HMR (ST-B&D) Delayed 2024 / 1-6625, दिनांक 19-03-2025 अनुसार श्री राज कुमार पुत्र श्री भागी राम, निवासी टीका भटेड, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) का आवेदन समस्त रिकार्ड व शपथ-पत्र सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ। जिसमें उल्लेख है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 19-03-1965 को हुआ परन्तु किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत भटेड के रिकार्ड में उक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण दिनांक 19-03-1965 को दर्ज न हो सका। प्रार्थी अब जन्म दिनांक उपरोक्त को ग्राम पंचायत भटेड में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री राज कुमार पुत्र श्री भागी राम, निवासी टीका भटेड, तहसील बमसन टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) की जन्म तिथि 19-03-1965 को ग्राम पंचायत भटेड के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 08-05-2025 तक असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर न्यायालय होकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही की जाएगी। उसके बाद का उजर जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 10-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकार एवं तहसीलदार,
तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवम् तहसीलदार, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी,
जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी पुत्री श्री लटुरिया राम, निवासी टीका दिम्मी, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी,
जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

अतिरिक्त जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु हमीरपुर के कार्यालय पत्र संख्या HFW-HMR (ST-B&D) Delayed 2024 / 1-8322, दिनांक 07-04-2025 अनुसार श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी पुत्री श्री लटुरिया राम, निवासी टीका दिम्मी, तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) का आवेदन समस्त रिकार्ड व शपथ-पत्र सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ, जिसमें उल्लेख है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 01-01-1945 को हुआ परन्तु किसी कारणवश ग्राम पंचायत दिम्मी के रिकार्ड में उक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण दिनांक 01-01-1945 को दर्ज न हो सका। प्रार्थिया अब जन्म दिनांक उपरोक्त को ग्राम पंचायत दिम्मी में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी पुत्री श्री लटुरिया राम, निवासी टीका दिम्मी, तहसील बमसन टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) की जन्म तिथि 01-01-1945 को ग्राम पंचायत दिम्मी के रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 08-05-2025 तक असालतन/वकालतन हाजिर न्यायालय होकर अपना उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही की जाएगी। उसके बाद का उजर जेरे समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 10-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / -

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकार एवं तहसीलदार,
तहसील बमसन स्थित टौणी देवी, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
10 / T / 2025	नाम दुरुस्ती	29-01-2025	16-05-2025

श्रीमती सुनीता कुमारी पुत्री माधो राम, वासी मोहाल बाड़ी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती under section 37(1) 1954 प्रार्थिया श्रीमती सुनीता कुमारी पुत्री श्री माधो राम, वासी मोहाल बाड़ी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती प्रार्थिया श्रीमती सुनीता कुमारी पुत्री श्री माधो राम, वासी मोहाल बाड़ी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख वाक्या मोहाल बाड़ी, करोट खास, पनेह अतरु में सीता देवी पुत्री श्री माधो राम दर्ज है, जबकि उनका सही नाम सुनीता कुमारी पुत्री श्री माधो राम है। लिहाजा इसे मोहाल बाड़ी, करोट खास, पनेह अतरु के राजस्व अभिलेख में दुरुस्त करके सीता देवी उर्फ सुनीता कुमारी पुत्री श्री माधो राम किया जाए।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 16-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 23-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / -

सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
34 / T / 2025	नाम दुरुस्ती	19-04-2025	16-05-2025

श्री प्रशोतम चन्द पुत्र श्री बचित्र सिंह, वासी मोहाल स्वाहल, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

प्रार्थना पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती under section 37(1) 1954 प्रार्थी श्री प्रशोतम चन्द पुत्र बचित्र सिंह, वासी मोहाल स्वाहल, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती प्रार्थी श्री प्रशोतम चन्द पुत्र श्री बचित्र सिंह, वासी मोहाल स्वाहल, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसकी माता का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख वाक्या मोहाल बाड़ी, करोट खास, पनेह अतरु में केसरी देवी पुत्री श्री शेरा दर्ज है जबकि उनका सही नाम पुष्पा देवी पुत्री श्री शेरा है। लिहाजा इसे मोहाल बाड़ी, करोट खास, पनेह अतरु के राजस्व अभिलेख में दुरुस्त करके केसरी देवी उर्फ पुष्पा देवी पुत्री श्री शेरा किया जाए।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 16-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में अदालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 23-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / -
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
29 / T / 2025	जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण	16-04-2025	08-05-2025

सुश्री पानो देवी पुत्री श्री खजाना राम, वासी मोहाल गाहरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Act, 1969 सुश्री पानो देवी पुत्री खजाना राम, वासी मोहाल गाहरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराये जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण सुश्री पानो देवी पुत्री श्री खजाना राम, वासी मोहाल गाहरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 04-03-1953 को ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में हुआ था तथा सहबन गलती से जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हो पाई है। लिहाजा इसे ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में दर्ज करने के लिए आदेश पारित किए जाएं।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 16-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
03 / NT / 2025	जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण	24-02-2025	13-05-2025

श्रीमती रेखा देवी पुत्री श्री कांशी राम, वासी मोहाल कसीरी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Act, 1969 श्रीमती रेखा देवी पुत्री श्री कांशी राम, वासी मोहाल कसीरी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराये जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण श्रीमती रेखा देवी पुत्री कांशी राम, वासी मोहाल कसीरी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में दायर किया है कि उनका जन्म दिनांक 20-07-1971 को ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में हुआ था तथा सहबन गलती से ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में दर्ज नहीं हो पाया है। लिहाजा इसे ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में दर्ज करने के लिए आदेश पारित किए जाएं।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 13-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / —
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
30 / T / 2025	जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण	17-04-2025	08-05-2025

सुश्री सरबो देवी पुत्री श्री लालू राम, वासी मोहाल डूहक, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Act, 1969 सुश्री सरबो देवी पुत्री श्री लालू राम, वासी मोहाल डूहक, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराये जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण सुश्री सरबो देवी पुत्री लालू राम, वासी मोहाल डूहक, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 15-03-1961 को ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में हुआ था तथा सहबन गलती से जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हो पायी है। लिहाजा इसे ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएं।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत डूहक में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 17-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / —
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
31 / T / 2025	जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण	17-04-2025	08-05-2025

सुश्री सुरेश कुमारी सड़याल पुत्री श्री मेहताब सिंह, वासी मोहाल कजोटी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Act, 1969 सुश्री सुरेश कुमारी सड़याल पुत्री श्री मेहताब सिंह, वासी मोहाल कजोटी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराये जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण सुश्री सुरेश कुमारी सड़याल पुत्री श्री मेहताब सिंह, वासी मोहाल कजोटी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 04-04-1969 को ग्राम पंचायत दाडला में हुआ था तथा सहबन गलती से जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हो पायी है। लिहाजा इसे ग्राम पंचायत दाडला में दर्ज करने के लिए आदेश पारित किए जाएं।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत दाडला में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 17-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
32/T/2025	जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण	21-04-2025	08-05-2025

श्री जगदीश चन्द पुत्र श्री मोहर सिंह, वासी मोहाल चकरियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Act, 1969 श्री जगदीश चन्द पुत्र श्री मोहर सिंह, वासी मोहाल चकरियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराये जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण श्री जगदीश चन्द पुत्र श्री मोहर सिंह, वासी मोहाल चकरियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 13-07-1959 को ग्राम पंचायत पटलान्दर में हुआ था तथा सहबन गलती से जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हो पायी है। लिहाजा इसे ग्राम पंचायत पटलान्दर में दर्ज करने के लिए आदेश पारित किए जाएं।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी

08-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत पटलान्दर में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 21-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर	किस्म मुकद्दमा	तारीख दायर	तारीख पेशी
35 / T / 2025	नाम दुरुस्ती	21-04-2025	08-05-2025

श्री केवल सिंह पुत्र श्री सर्वण कुमार, वासी मोहाल भटेरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

प्रार्थना—पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती under section 37(1) 1954 प्रार्थी श्री केवल सिंह पुत्र श्री सर्वण कुमार, वासी मोहाल भटेरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती प्रार्थी श्री केवल सिंह पुत्र श्री सर्वण कुमार, वासी मोहाल भटेरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना—पत्र दायर किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख वाक्या मोहाल भटेरा में केवल कुमार उर्फ केवल कृष्ण पुत्र श्री सर्वण कुमार दर्ज है, जबकि उनका सही नाम केवल सिंह पुत्र श्री सर्वण कुमार है। लिहाजा इसे मोहाल भटेरा के राजस्व अभिलेख में दुरुस्त करके केवल कुमार उर्फ केवल सिंह पुत्र श्री सर्वण कुमार किया जाए।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 21-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर 33/T/2025	किस्म मुकद्दमा जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण	तारीख दायर 21-04-2025	तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025
-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

श्री देश राज पुत्र श्री काली दास, वासी मोहाल टिहरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)
वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता प्रतिवादी।

जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Act, 1969 श्री देश राज पुत्र श्री काली दास, वासी मोहाल टिहरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराये जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण श्री देश राज पुत्र श्री काली दास, वासी मोहाल टिहरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 09-01-1965 को ग्राम पंचायत टिहरा में हुआ था तथा सहबन गलती से जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हो पायी है। लिहाजा इसे ग्राम पंचायत टिहरा में दर्ज करने के लिए आदेश पारित किए जाएं।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत टिहरा में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 21-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर 09/T/2025	किस्म मुकद्दमा जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण	तारीख दायर 21-02-2025	तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025
-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

श्री जसवन्त प्रसाद पुत्र श्री बक्शी राम, वासी मोहाल गाड़ी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)
वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता प्रतिवादी।

जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण श्री जसवन्त प्रसाद पुत्र श्री बक्शी राम, वासी मोहाल गाड़ी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

प्रार्थना—पत्र बराये जन्म पंजीकरण जसवन्त प्रसाद पुत्र श्री बक्शी राम, वासी मोहाल गाड़ी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) ने इस अदालत में दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 02-04-1959 को ग्राम पंचायत पटलान्दर में हुआ था तथा सहबन गलती से जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हो पायी है। लिहाजा इसे ग्राम पंचायत पटलान्दर में दर्ज करने के लिए आदेश पारित किए जाएं।

अतः प्रतिवादी आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 08-05-2025 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत पटलान्दर में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज नहीं सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 21-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)।

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

In the matter of :

1. Naveen Kumar aged 25 years s/o Sh. Jagdish Chand, r/o Village Garoru Bula, P.O. Kanerad, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Nancy aged 18 years d/o Sh. Jaevan Kumar, r/o Bhatawan, P.O. Bhatawan, Tehsil Khundian, District Kangra, H.P. . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Subject.— Notice of the Intended Marriage.

Naveen Kumar aged 25 years s/o Sh. Jagdish Chand, r/o Village Garoru Bula, P.O. Kanerad, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Nancy aged 18 years d/o Sh. Jaevan Kumar, r/o Bhatawan, P.O. Bhatawan, Tehsil Khundian, District Kangra, H.P. have filed an application in the court of undersigned under section 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 in which they stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within three months of calendar.

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 08-05-2025. The objections received after 08-05-2025 will not be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 20-03-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

SANJEET SINGH, H.A.S.,
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

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

In the matter of :

1. Mahinder Pal aged 21 years s/o Sh. Dharam Pal, r/o Village Mehlaru, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Priyanka Kumari aged 19 years d/o Sh. Kamlesh Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Rangar, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur, H.P. . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

. . *Respondent.*

Subject.— Notice of the Intended Marriage.

Mahinder Pal aged 21 years s/o Sh. Dharam Pal, r/o Village Mehlaru, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Priyanka Kumari aged 19 years d/o Sh. Kamlesh Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Rangar, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur, H.P. have filed an application in the court of undersigned under section 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 in which they stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within three months of calendar.

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 08-05-2025. The objections received after 08-05-2025 will not entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 27-03-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

SANJEET SINGH, H.P.A.S.,
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

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

In the matter of :

1. Kartar Chand aged 44 years s/o Sh. Kishori Lal, r/o Village Darghorballi, P.O. Chabutra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).
2. Santosh Kumari aged 39 years d/o Sh. Mast Ram, r/o Village Darghorballi, P.O. Chabutra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur, H.P. . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

. . *Respondent.*

Subject.— Notice of the Intended Marriage.

Kartar Chand aged 44 years s/o Sh. Kishori Lal, r/o Village Darghorballi, P.O. Chabutra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Santosh Kumari aged 39 years d/o Sh. Mast Ram, r/o Village Darghorballi, P.O. Chabutra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur, H.P. have filed an application in the court of undersigned under section 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 in which they stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within three months of calendar.

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 08-05-2025. The objections received after 08-05-2025 will not entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 27-03-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

SANJEET SINGH, H. P.A.S.,
*Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

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

In the matter of :

1. Amarjeet aged 39 years s/o Garib Dass, r/o Village Barain, P.O. Karot, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).
2. Sunita Devi aged 26 years d/o Ramesh Chand, r/o Village Bagehra, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) . . *Applicants.*

Versus

The General Public

Respondent.

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).

Amarjeet aged 39 years s/o Garib Dass, r/o Village Barain, P.O. Karot, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Sunita Devi aged 26 years d/o Ramesh Chand, r/o Village Bagehra, P.O. Bir Bagehra, 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 01-08-2021 in their complex at Village Bagehra, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur 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 14-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 01-04-2025 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 Sh. Sanjeet Singh, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Purshotam Chand aged 33 years s/o Ashok Kumar, r/o Village Chamarkar, P.O. Thana, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Namrata Kumari aged 18 years d/o Sh. Manohar Lal, r/o Village Dhamrola, P.O. Kharwar, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

Applicants.

Versus

The General Public

Respondent.

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).

Purshotam Chand aged 33 years s/o Ashok Kumar, r/o Village Chamarkar, P.O. Thana, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Namrata Kumari aged 18 years d/o Sh. Manohar Lal, r/o Village Dhamrola, P.O. Kharwar, Tehsil Bhoranj, 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 11-10-2024 in their complex at Village Dhamrola, P.O. Kharwar, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur, 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 14-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 01-04-2025 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 Sh. Sanjeet Singh, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sonu Sharma aged 46 years s/o Ramesh Chand, r/o Village Bagehra, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Meena aged 34 years d/o Sh. Sarwan Singh, r/o Village Bagehra, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

Applicants.

Versus

The General Public

Respondent.

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).

Sonu Sharma aged 46 years s/o Ramesh Chand, r/o Village Bagehra, P.O. Bir Bagehra, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Meena aged 34 years d/o Sh. Sarwan Singh, r/o Village Bagehra, P.O. Bir Bagehra, 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 16-09-2024 at Murli Manohar Mandir Sujanpur, District Hamirpur, 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 14-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 03-04-2025 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 Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bhoranj,
Distt. Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh**

1. Sh. Ajay Kumar s/o Sh. Diwan Chand, Village Khatrwar, P.O. Tikkri Minhansa, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) aged 25 years old.

2. Divya Samadhan Ingle d/o Sh. Samadhan Vithal Ingle, r/o Patil Gali Rohinkhed, Motala Buldhana Maharashtra aged 22 years old

Versus

General Public

Sh. Ajay Kumar s/o Sh. Diwan Chand, Village Khatrwar, P.O. Tikkri Minhansa, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur & Divya Samadhan Ingle d/o Sh. Samadhan Vithal Ingle, r/o Patil Gali Rohinkhed, Motala Buldhana Maharashtra 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 dated 14-02-2025 at Nawahi Mata Mandir Sarkaghat, Distt. Mandi, 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 objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 17-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 01-04-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

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

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bhoranj,
Distt. Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh**

1. Sh. Surinder Kumar s/o Sh. Kirpu Ram, Village Duhga Khurd, P.O. Duhga, Tehsil & Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) aged 56 years old.

2. Urmila Devi d/o Shakti Chand, Village Drun Nugriyan, P.O. Patta, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur aged 47 years old.

Versus

General Public

Sh. Surinder Kumar s/o Sh. Kirpu Ram, Village Duhga Khurd, P.O. Duhga, Tehsil & Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) & Urmila Devi d/o Shakti Chand, Village Drun Nugriyan, P.O. Patta, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur 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 dated 11-12-1994 at Village Drun Nugriyan, P.O. Patta, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur 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 objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 22-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 05-05-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

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

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

In the matter of :

Anjana Kumari

Versus

General Public

Notice to General Public.

Smt. Anjana Kumari d/o Sh. Braham Dass, r/o Village Kotla, 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 16-09-1976 but due to ignorance the same could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Dalchera. 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 any person having any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant which is 16-09-1976, they can file their objections either in writing or through their counsel within a period of 30 days from the date of issue of this notice, if no objection is received from any person regarding the date of birth which is 16-09-1976 the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 21-04-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate-cum-Naib Tehsildar,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

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

In the matter of :

Lata Kumari

Versus

General Public

Notice to General Public.

Smt. Lata Kumari d/o Sh. Shiv Nand, r/o Village & Post Office Loharli, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, Distt. Hamirpur has applied in this office for the entry of her date of birth which has taken place on 30-06-1976 but due to ignorance the same could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Kalwal. 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 any person having any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant which is 30-06-1976, they can file their objections either in writing or through their counsel within a period of 30 days from the date of issue of this notice, if no objection is received from any person regarding the date of birth which is 30-06-1976 the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 21-04-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate-cum-Naib Tehsildar,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

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

In the matter of :

Sulochna Kumari

Versus

General Public

Notice to General Public.

Smt. Sulochna Kumari d/o Sh. Hukum Chand, r/o Village & Post Office Chakmoh, 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 13-11-1969 but due to ignorance the same could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Chakmoh. 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 any person having any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant which is 13-11-1969, they can file their objections either in writing or through their counsel within a period of 30 days from the date of issue of this notice, if no objection is received from any person regarding the date of birth which is 13-11-1969 the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 21-04-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate-cum-Naib Tehsildar,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

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

In the matter of :

Soma Devi

Versus

General Public

Notice to General Public.

Smt. Soma Devi d/o Sh. Bakshi Ram, r/o Village Jaral, Post Office Chakmoh, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, Distt. Hamirpur at present w/o Sh. Sukh Dev, r/o Village Samtana Khurd, Tappa & 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 28-08-1967 but due to ignorance the same could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Samailla. 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 any person having any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant which is 28-08-1967, they can file their objections either in writing or through their counsel within a period of 30 days from the date of issue of this notice, if no objection is received from any person regarding the date of birth which is 28-08-1967 the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 21-04-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate-cum-Naib Tehsildar,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (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. Vinod Kumar age 25 years s/o Sh. Purshottam Chand, r/o Village Chhatoli, P.O. Jaure Amb, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Minakshi age 19 years d/o Sh. Narayan Singh, r/o Village & P.O. Marog, Tehsil Chopal, District Shimla (H.P.) .. *Appellants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of Marriage

Mr. Vinod Kumar and Ms. Minakshi 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 16-05-2025. In case no objection is received by 16-05-2025, 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 16-04-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Marriage Officer-cum-SDM,
Sub-Division Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Sh. Rajender Kumar Gautam, 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. Pardeep Kumar age 34 years s/o Sh. Dalel Singh, r/o Village Kachhwin, P.O. Sohari, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Sakshi Gupta age 39 years wd/o Sh. Vijay Kumar, r/o Village Lakhoh, P.O. Balh Bihal, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).
.. *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of Marriage

Mr. Pardeep Kumar and Ms. Sakshi Gupta have filed an application under section 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they have solemnized their marriage on dated 19-03-2025 as per Hindu rites and customs at Kalka Mata Mandir, Tikker Rajputan, Tehsil Barsar, Distt. Hamirpur, H.P.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 16-05-2025. In case no objection is received by 16-05-2025, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 16-04-2025.

Seal.

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

In the Court of Sh. Rajender Kumar Gautam, 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. Vishal age 30 years s/o Sh. Suresh Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Ghumarli, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Saswatijapa Swain age 23 years d/o Sh. Jagan Nath, r/o Bardamala Dakhinasahi, Saswatipur, Puri Odisha.
.. *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of Marriage

Mr. Vishal and Ms. Saswatijapa Swain have filed an application under section 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they have solemnized their marriage on dated 05-04-2025 as per Hindu rites and customs at Kalka Mata Mandir, Tikker Rajputan, Tehsil Barsar, Distt. Hamirpur, H.P.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 16-05-2025. In case no objection is received by 16-05-2025, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 16-04-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-SDM,
Sub-Division Barsar, District Hamirpur (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. Narender Singh age 37 years s/o Sh. Mahender Singh, r/o Village Kalohan, P.O. Bumbloo, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Shalini Parmar age 24 years d/o Sh. Surinder Singh, r/o Village & P.O. Jalari, Tehsil Nadaun, Distt. Hamirpur, H.P. .. *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of Marriage

Mr. Narender Singh and Ms. Shalini Parmar have filed an application under section 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they have solemnized their marriage on dated 21-04-2025 as per Hindu rites and customs at Shiv Mandir Harma, Tehsil Barsar, Distt. Hamirpur, H.P.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 21-05-2025. In case no objection is received by 21-05-2025, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 21-04-2025.

Seal.

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

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

In the matter of :

1. I Om Parkash age 36 years s/o Sh. Joginder Singh, r/o Village Neri, P.O. Jaure Amb, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Chandni age 22 years d/o Sh. Ram Suhak, r/o Ward No. 11, Deep Nagar Mandi, Mullapur, P.O. Mullapur, Distt. Ludhiana .. *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice of Marriage

Mr. Om Parkash and Ms. Chandni have filed an application under section 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they have solemnized their marriage on dated 07-04-2025 as per Hindu rites and customs at Sen Bhagat Mandir Mehre, Tehsil Barsar, Distt. Hamirpur, H.P.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 21-05-2025. In case no objection is received by 21-05-2025, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 21-04-2025.

Seal.

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

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)**

1. Shri Rajender Kumar s/o Sh. Balber Singh, Village Bhajlah, P.O. Luder Mahadev, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, H.P. age 28 year old.

2. Senichangme M Sangma d/o Dimathson Ch Marak, House No. 3, Sellsella Mandagre, Sellsella, West Garo Hills Meghalaya, age 27 years old . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Shri Rajender Kumar s/o Sh. Balber Singh, Village Bhajlah, P.O. Luder Mahadev, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, H.P. & Senichangme M Sangma d/o Dimathson Ch Marak, House No. 3, Sellsella Mandagre, Sellsella, West Garo Hills Meghalaya 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 dated 04-04-2025 at Shiv Mandir Luder Mahadev, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur, 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 objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 23-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 05-05-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub Divisional Magistrate,
Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

**In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H. P.)**

1. Sh. Abhishek Kumar s/o Sh. Devinder Kumar, Village Bairi Brahmana, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, age 31 year old.

2. Puneet Kalyan d/o Sh. Darshan Singh, r/o VTC Bhadla Nicha, P.O. Khanna, Sub-Distt. Khanna, Distt. Ludhiana, Punjab age 30 years old . . Applicants.

Versus

General Public

Sh. Abhishek Kumar s/o Sh. Davinder Kumar, Village Bairi Brahmana, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur & Puneet Kalyan d/o Sh. Darshan Singh, r/o VTC Bhadla Nicha, P.O. Khanna, Sub-Distt. Khanna, Distt. Ludhiana, Punjab 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 dated 03-11-2024 at Village Bairi Brahmana, P.O. Bhukkar, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, 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 objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 31-05-2025. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 16-04-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-

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

ब अदालत उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, निरमण्ड, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)

श्री अमृत लाल पुत्र श्री बालक राम, निवासी गांव डगेढ, डाकघर तनून, तहसील निरमण्ड, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

उनवान मुकद्दमा.—जेर धारा 8(4) अधिनियम, 1996 के अन्तर्गत विवाह पंजीकरण करने बारे।

उनवान मुकद्दमा प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 8(4) विवाह पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1996 के अन्तर्गत इस कार्यालय में अमृत लाल पुत्र श्री बालक राम, निवासी गांव डगेढ, डाकघर तनून, तहसील निरमण्ड, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) ने उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पत्र गुजार कर निवेदन किया है कि उसका विवाह हिन्दू मैरिज एक्ट के तहत श्रीमती बिमला पुत्री लाल सिंह, निवासी वार्ड नं0 9, चलालन कुरली एस0ए0एस0 नगर मोहाली, पंजाब—140 103 के साथ हिन्दू रीति—रिवाजानुसार दिनांक 04—04—2024 को हुआ परन्तु अज्ञानता के कारण निश्चित अवधि में अपना विवाह ग्राम पंचायत बाडी, तहसील निरमण्ड, जिल्ला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज नहीं कर सका और जिस विषय उसने अपना शपथ—पत्र प्रस्तुत किया जिसमें सायल ने ग्राम पंचायत बाडी में उसका विवाह पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में विवाह पंजीकृत/दर्ज करने का अनुरोध कर रखा है।

इस इशतहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति को अमृत लाल पुत्र श्री बालक राम, निवासी गांव डगेढ, डाकघर तनून, तहसील निरमण्ड, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) के साथ बिमला पुत्री लाल सिंह, निवासी वार्ड नं0 9, चलालन कुरली एस0ए0एस0 नगर मोहाली, पंजाब—140 103 के विवाह का कोई किसी प्रकार का एतराज हो तो दिनांक 09—05—2025 तक हमारे कार्यालय में हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक एतराज प्रस्तुत करे उक्त तारीख के बाद कोई भी एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा और समझा जावेगा कि उपरोक्त अमृत लाल पुत्र श्री बालक राम के बिमला पुत्री लाल सिंह के विवाह पंजीकृत करने बारे किसी का

कोई एतराज नहीं है ताकि सचिव ग्राम पंचायत बाडी को विवाह पंजीकृत करने के आदेश पारित किया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 09-04-2025 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
निरमण्ड, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)।

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

1. Gyalbu Sherpa s/o Mingmar Sherpa, r/o Village Listi Anchal Bagmati, District Sindhupalchok Nepal at present residing at Village Jatehar Bihal, Post Office Katrain, Tehsil and Distt. Kullu (H.P.).

2. Narbada Magar d/o Deepak Bahadur Magar, r/o Village Jantarkhani, District Okhaldhunga Nepal at present residing at Village Jatehar Bihal, Post Office Katrain, Tehsil and District Kullu (H.P.)

..Applicants.

Versus

General Public

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

Gyalbu Sherpa and Narbada Magar 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 16-04-2025 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 writing before this court on or before 17-05-2025. The objection received after 17-05-2025 will not be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 19-04-2025 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal.

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

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्री देव राज पुत्र श्री ओतू पुत्र श्री जीतू, निवासी गांव व डा0 करजां, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इश्तहार बाबत दुरुस्ती राजस्व अभिलेख।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्री देव राज पुत्र श्री ओतू पुत्र श्री जीतू, निवासी गांव व डा0 करजां, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि खाता खतौनी नं0 77/142, खसरा नं0 210, रकबा 00-01-14 है0 व भूमि खाता खतौनी नं0 76/139, ता 141, कित्ता 9, रकबा तादादी 00-79-35 है0 व भूमि खाता खतौनी नं0 78/143, खसरा नं0 211, रकबा तादादी 00-08-20 है0 वाक्या मुहाल हरिपुर फाटी सोयल, कोठी बरशाई, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2019-20 व भूमि खाता/खतौनी 92/133, 134, कित्ता 6, रकबा तादादी 00-33-64 है0 वाक्या मुहाल व फाटी सोयल, कोठी बरशाई, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2021-2022 में उनका नाम देवी सरन दर्ज है जोकि गलत है जबकि उनका सही नाम देव राज है। इसलिए उन्होंने अनुरोध किया है कि मेरा सही नाम देव राज वरशाई के राजस्व अभिलेख में दर्ज किया जाये जिस बाबत आवेदक ने जमाबन्दी की कॉपी, रिपोर्ट पटवारी पटवार वृत्त वरशाई, परिवार नकल, ब्यान हल्फिया, राशन कार्ड की छायाप्रति, आधार कार्ड की कॉपी तथा लिखित ब्यान आवेदक से पाया गया कि आवेदक का सही नाम देव राज है और उक्त नाम को वरशाई के राजस्व अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को श्री देव राज पुत्र श्री ओतू के नाम दुरुस्ती वरशाई के राजस्व अभिलेख में दर्ज कराने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 15-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार वरशाई के राजस्व अभिलेख में सही नाम दर्ज कराने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 07-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

In the Court of Executive Magistrate, Anni, District Kullu (H.P.)

Sat Pal

. . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Subject.—Notice under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Sat Pal s/o Sh. Ram Dass, r/o Village Goski, P.O. Chowai, Tehsil Anni, District Kullu, H.P. has moved an application through District Registrar (B&D)-cum-Chief Medical Officer, Kullu in the office of the undersigned accompnaying with an affidavit stating that the death registration event of his Grand Father Sh. Alam Chand s/o Sh. Bale Ram died on 02-05-1980 has not been entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Khani.

Hence, the general public is hereby made aware through this notice that if any person or relatives have any objection regarding entering death event of the applicant's Grand Father died on 02-05-1980 in the Panchayat record of Gram Panchayat Khani, he/she/they may file his/ her/their objections on or before 25-05-2025 before this court. In case of non-filing of any objection, the *ex-parte* order will be passed.

Given under my seal and signature on this 8th of April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Anni, District Kullu (H.P.).

In the Court of Executive Magistrate, Anni, District Kullu (H.P.)

Vijay Singh

. . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Subject.—Notice under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Vijay Singh s/o Sh. Jhunkru Ram, r/o Village Sarli, P.O. Dalash, Tehsil Anni, District Kullu, H.P. has moved an application in the office of the undersigned accompnaying with an affidavit stating that the birth event of his son *i.e.* born on 06-01-2011 has not been entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Dalash.

Hence, the general public is hereby made aware through this notice that if any person or relatives have any objection regarding entering birth event of the applicant's son Sarijal, born on 06-01-2011 in the Panchayat record of Gram Panchayat Dalash, he/she/they may file his/ her/their objections on or before 25-05-2025 before this court. In case of non-filing of any objection, the *ex-parte* order will be passed.

Given under my seal and signature on this 8th of April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Anni, District Kullu (H.P.).

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती गंगा गुरंग पत्नी श्री भीम गुरंग मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी हाऊस नं0 227, वार्ड नं0 7, नजदीक पुलिस स्टेशन मनाली, डाकघर मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इश्तहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

श्रीमती गंगा गुरंग पत्नी श्री भीम गुरंग मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी हाऊस नं0 227, वार्ड नं0 7, नजदीक पुलिस स्टेशन मनाली, डाकघर मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि उनके पुत्र आयुष गुरंग का जन्म 04—12—2005 को हुआ है परन्तु नगर परिषद मनाली के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है जिसे अब दर्ज करवाना चाहते हैं। इस बाबत क्षेत्रीय अभीकरणों से छानबीन करवाई गई तथा पाया गया कि आयुष गुरंग पुत्र श्री भीम गुरंग की जन्म तिथि 04—12—2005 है तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को आयुष गुरंग पुत्र श्री भीम गुरंग की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 28—05—2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार नगर परिषद मनाली के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11—04—2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

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

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती गंगा गुरंग पत्नी श्री भीम गुरंग मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी हाऊस नं0 227, वार्ड नं0 7, नजदीक पुलिस स्टेशन मनाली, डाकघर मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रकाशन इश्तहार बाबत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे।

श्रीमती गंगा गुरंग पत्नी श्री भीम गुरंग मूल निवासी नेपाल, हाल निवासी हाऊस नं0 227, वार्ड नं0 7, नजदीक पुलिस स्टेशन मनाली, डाकघर मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र गुजारा है कि उनकी पुत्री आसमा गुरंग का जन्म 30—07—2012 को हुआ है परन्तु नगर परिषद मनाली के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है जिसे अब दर्ज करवाना चाहते हैं। इस बाबत क्षेत्रीय अभीकरणों से छानबीन करवाई गई तथा पाया गया कि आसमा गुरंग पुत्री श्री भीम गुरंग की जन्म तिथि 30—07—2012 है तथा जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे सिफारिश की गई है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को आसमा गुरंग पुत्री श्री भीम गुरंग की जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 28-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत हजा में अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। इसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर/एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा तथा नियमानुसार नगर परिषद मनाली के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अभिलेख में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

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

**Before the District Registrar (Marriages)-cum-Additional Deputy Commissioner, Kullu,
District Kullu (H.P.)**

1. Karan s/o Brestu, r/o Village Juani, P.O. Neoli, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.).
2. Muskan d/o Sh. Radhe Shyam, r/o Village Sanehad, P.O. Dlah, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H.P.).

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Regarding Registration of Marriage u/s 8(3) of the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.

Karan s/o Brestu, r/o Village Juani, P.O. Neoli, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.) & Muskan d/o Sh. Radhe Shyam, r/o Village Sanehad, P.O. Dlah, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith the affidavits in the office of undersigned stating therein that they have solemnised their marriage on 26-09-2024, but marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriage, Gram Panchayat Neoli in Tehsil Kullu, District Kullu, H.P.

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the general public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage, 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 my hand and seal of the court today on 11th April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
(ASHWANI KUMAR),
District Registrar (Marriages)-cum-ADC
Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.).

**Before the District Registrar (Marriages)-cum-Additional Deputy Commissioner, Kullu,
District Kullu (H.P.)**

1. Sh. Deepak s/o Sh. Dal Singh, r/o House No. 92, Ward No. 5, Sarswati Bazar, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.).

2. Smt. Sita Singh d/o Sh. Ram Lal, r/o V.P.O. Ghumarwin, Tehsil Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur (H.P.).

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Regarding Registration of Marriage u/s 8(3) of the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.

Sh. Deepak s/o Sh. Dal Singh, r/o House No. 92, Ward No. 5, Sarswati Bazar, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.) & Smt. Sita Singh d/o Sh. Ram Lal, r/o V.P.O. Ghumarwin, Tehsil Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith the affidavits in the office of undersigned stating therein that they have solemnised their marriage on 25-06-2024, but marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriage, Municipal Council Kullu in Tehsil Kullu, District Kullu, H.P.

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the general public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage, 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 my hand and seal of the court today on 11th April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
(ASHWANI KUMAR),
District Registrar (Marriages)-cum-ADC-
Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.).

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप-तहसील कोटला,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं० :
17 / RNTK/2025

किस्म मुकद्दमा :
नाम दुरुस्ती

तारीख पेशी :
05-05-2025

रीना देवी पत्नी पवन कुमार पुत्र प्रशोतम सिंह, निवासी महाल सोलदा, उप-तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि० प्र०।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान : नाम दुरुस्ती हेतु आवेदन पत्र।

प्रार्थिया रीना देवी ने इस अदालत में अपने पति के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल सोलदा में पवन सिंह दर्ज है। जबकि बच्चों के सभी दस्तावेजों में पवन कुमार दर्ज है। इस बारे प्रार्थिया ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2022-23 महाल सोलदा, आधार कार्ड, स्कूल प्रमाण-पत्र की प्रति, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इशतहार सूचित किया जाता है कि पवन सिंह की बजाये पवन सिंह उर्फ पवन कुमार किये जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 05-05-2025 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—

सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप-तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Seema Kundi w/o Sh. Vinod Kumar Kundi, r/o House No. 204, Ward No. 10, Diara Sector, Tehsil Sadar, District Bilaspur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Seema to Seema Kundi. Concerned note.

SEEMA KUNDI

w/o Sh. Vinod Kumar Kundi,

r/o House No. 204, Ward No. 10,

Diara Sector, Tehsil Sadar, District Bilaspur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Suresh Thakur s/o Sh. Jai Singh, r/o Village Dailayn, Tehsil Theog, Fagu (386), Shimla (H.P.)-171 209 declare that my daughter's name Priyanshu (Old Name) she is my minor daughter. I have changed name of my daughter from Priyanshu (Old Name) to Priyanshi (New Name). All concerned please note.

SURESH THAKUR

s/o Sh. Jai Singh,

r/o Village Dailayn,

Tehsil Theog, Fagu (386), Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Swarana Devi aged about 70 years w/o Man Chand Katoch, r/o Village Upper Dattal, P.O. Tiker, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.)-176 087 declare that I have changed my name in the Aadhar Card No. 5487 4363 3246 from Sarwana Devi to Swarana Devi. All concerned please may note.

SWARANA DEVI
w/o Man Chand Katoch,
r/o Village Upper Dattal, P.O. Tiker,
Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra(H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Mathura Devi w/o Sh. Bhim Sen, r/o V.P.O. Sangalwara, Tehsil Thunag, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor son's name from Aadresh Kumar to Adarsh Kumar for all purposes in future. Please note.

MATHURA DEVI
w/o Sh. Bhim Sen,
r/o V.P.O. Sangalwara,
Tehsil Thunag, District Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Inder Dev Verma s/o Sh. Med Ram, r/o Village Mandri, P.O. Chalahal, Sub-Tehsil Dhami, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Mishika to Bhaavika. Please note.

INDER DEV VERMA
s/o Sh. Med Ram,
r/o Village Mandri, P.O. Chalahal,
Sub-Tehsil Dhami, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Parshotam Singh s/o Sh. Basawa Singh, r/o V.P.O. Rajja Bag, Tehsil Nurpur, District Kangra (H.P.) declare that my grand daughter's name in her Aadhar Card has been wrongly entered as Sajel Thakur. Her correct name is Sejal.

PARSHOTAM SINGH
s/o Sh. Basawa Singh,
r/o V.P.O. Rajja Bag,
Tehsil Nurpur, District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Desh Raj Kamal s/o Sh. Sukh Ram, r/o Village Bhawani, P.O. Darpa, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor son's name from Sehaj to Sahaj Kamal for all purposes in future. Please note.

DESH RAJ KAMAL
s/o Sh. Sukh Ram,
r/o Village Bhawani. P.O. Darpa,
Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Shimbrow Devi w/o Sh. Hoshiyar Singh, Ward No. 2, V.P.O. Maniara, P.O. Pahra, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.)-176 087 hereby declare that I have changed my name from Simro Devi to Shimbrow Devi. Note the relevant information.

SHIMBROW DEVI
w/o Sh. Hoshiyar Singh,
Ward No. 2, V.P.O. Maniara,
P.O. Pahra, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Nita Kumari w/o Sh. Pritam Chand, r/o V.P.O. Phata, P.O. Bindraban, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.)-176 061 hereby declare that I have changed my name from Anita Kumari to Nita Kumari. Note the relevant information.

NITA KUMARI
w/o Sh. Pritam Chand,
r/o V.P.O. Phata, P.O. Bindraban,
Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Prem Chand s/o Sh. Mangat Ram aged about 49 years, r/o Village Jamath, P.O. Tikkari, Tehsil Nerwa, District Shimla (H.P.) do hereby declare that I have changed my sons's name from Anshul Gazta (Old Name) to Anshu Gazta (New Name). All concerned please may note.

PREM CHAND
s/o Sh. Mangat Ram
r/o Village Jamath, P.O. Tikkari,
Tehsil Nerwa, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Hira Mani w/o Late Sh. Himmat Singh, r/o Village Majhali, P.O. Deothi, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla (H.P.) my name in Aadhar Card is Hiri Devi, whereas in Panchayat records it is Hira Mani. It should be corrected to Hira Mani.

HIRA MANI
w/o Late Sh. Himmat Singh,
r/o Village Majhali, P.O. Deothi,
Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Chet Ram s/o Sh. Karam Singh, r/o Village Bandhi, Tehsil Aut, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that I want to change my minor daughter's name Pratigya to Pratiksha in my daughter's Aadhar Card No. 6890 1202 3722. Concerned note.

CHET RAM
s/o Sh. Karam Singh,
r/o Village Bandhi,
Tehsil Aut, District Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Bina Devi w/o Sh. Inder Pal, r/o VPO Rani Kotla, Tehsil Sadar, District Bilaspur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor son's name as Divyanshu but name of my son wrongly entered as Dewansu Sharma in his Aadhar Card and Diwanshu Sharma in birth record which should be correct as Divyanshu.

BINA DEVI
w/o Sh. Inder Pal,
r/o VPO Rani Kotla,
Tehsil Sadar, District Bilaspur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Tejinder Buddha s/o Sh. Tara Bahadur Buddha, r/o Village and P.O. Sunnam, Tehsil Pooh, District Kinnaur (H.P.). My name is wrongly recorded as Tejender Buddha in the Aadhar Card, while it is recorded as Tejinder Buddha in the 10th certificate. This name should be corrected as Tejinder Buddha.

TEJINDER BUDDHA
s/o Sh. Tara Bahadur Buddha,
r/o Village and P.O. Sunnam,
Tehsil Pooh, District Kinnaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sanju Ram s/o Sh. Kalma Nand, r/o Village Khaneoli, P.O. Devnagar, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla (H.P.)-172 022 declare that my daughter's name wrongly entered as Shrishti in her Aadhar Card. Whereas my daughter's correct name is Sarishti. All concerned note.

SANJU RAM
s/o Sh. Kalma Nand,
r/o Village Khaneoli, P.O. Devnagar,
Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Niju Ram s/o Sh. Kishnu Ram, r/o Village Khatlaghrat Thachwa, P.O. Rampur, Tehsil Nirmand, District Kullu (H.P.). My daughter's name is Manikashi in the Aadhar Card, while it is Meenakashi in the Panchayat records. In such a situation, the name Meenakashi should be corrected.

NIJU RAM
s/o Sh. Kishnu Ram,
r/o Village Khatlaghrat Thachwa,
P.O. Rampur, Tehsil Nirmand, District Kullu (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Hitender Sharma s/o Sh. Atma Ram, r/o Village Sungal, P.O. Barour, Tehsil and District Chamba (H.P.) declare that my name in my daughter Bhargavi Sharma 10th certificate have wrongly entered as Hitender whereas my correct name is Hitender Sharma. Concerned note.

HITENDER SHARMA
s/o Sh. Atma Ram,
r/o Village Sungal, P.O. Barour,
Tehsil and District Chamba (H.P.).

ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)

श्री विरेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री ध्यान सिंह, निवासी ग्राम पोडन, डाकघर पौडिया, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्याधी

विषय.—जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत ग्राम पंचायत पौडिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि के पंजीकरण बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री विरेन्दर सिंह पुत्र श्री ध्यान सिंह, निवासी ग्राम पौडन, डाकघर पौडिया, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौडिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थी अब अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौडिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में निम्न प्रकार से दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	रिया	पुत्री	21-03-2019

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिन के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र पर आवश्यक आदेश पारित करके ग्राम पंचायत पौडिया को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)

श्री हलीस पुत्र श्री सबीर दीन, निवासी ग्राम किमा चन्द्रावली, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्याथी।

विषय.—जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि के पंजीकरण बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री हलीस पुत्र श्री सबीर दीन, निवासी ग्राम किमा चन्द्रावली, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थी अब अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में निम्न प्रकार से दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	आसिफा	पुत्री	02-02-2020

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिन के भीतर किसी भी कार्य

दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र पर आवश्यक आदेश पारित करके ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)

श्रीमती नजमा पत्नी श्री मोहम्मद रमजान, निवासी ग्राम क्यारला, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्याधी।

विषय.—प्रार्थिया का जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाए जाने बारे।
की अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण करने बारे।

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती नजमा पत्नी श्री मोहम्मद रमजान, निवासी ग्राम क्यारला, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थिया अब अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में निम्न प्रकार से दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	तंजील	पुत्री	03-02-2017

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिन के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र पर आवश्यक आदेश पारित करके ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)**

श्री शहवान पुत्र श्री नजीबो दीन, निवासी ग्राम किमा चन्द्रावली, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्याथी।

विषय.— जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि के पंजीकरण बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री शहवान पुत्र श्री नजीबो दीन, निवासी ग्राम किमा चन्द्रावली, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपनी पुत्रियों के नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थी अब अपनी पुत्रियों का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में निम्न प्रकार से दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	मेहक	पुत्री	30-07-2016
2.	अगरीना	पुत्री	20-05-2018
3.	अलीना	पुत्री	18-08-2020

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिन के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र पर आवश्यक आदेश पारित करके ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)**

श्री मोहम्मद अदरीस पुत्र मोहम्मद यासीन, निवासी ग्राम क्यारला, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्याथी।

विषय.—जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि के पंजीकरण बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री मोहम्मद अदरीस पुत्र मोहम्मद यासीन, निवासी ग्राम क्यारला, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थी अब अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में निम्न प्रकार से दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	बुशरा बेगम	पुत्री	10-10-2014

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिन के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र पर आवश्यक आदेश पारित करके ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)

श्रीमती आसीमा पत्नी श्री मोहसीन शेख, निवासी ग्राम क्यारला, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी

विषय.—प्रार्थिया का जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर दर्ज करवाए जाने बारे। की अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण करने बारे।

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती आसीमा पत्नी श्री मोहसीन शेख, निवासी ग्राम क्यारला, डाकघर केदी, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थिया अब अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में निम्न प्रकार से दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	मेहवीश	पुत्री	18-12-2019

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिन के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र पर आवश्यक आदेश पारित करके ग्राम पंचायत पौलिया को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 08-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)

श्री नैन सिंह पुत्र श्री रूप, ग्राम निवासी ग्याह, डाकघर ग्याह, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)
प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.— 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण करने बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री नैन सिंह पुत्र श्री रूप, ग्राम निवासी ग्याह, डाकघर ग्याह, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत मानू-भाविया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थी अब अपना पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत मानू-भाविया के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है जोकि इस प्रकार है :—

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	नैन सिंह	स्वयं	15-10-2064

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिनों के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा सचिव ग्राम पंचायत मानू-भाविया को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 21-04-2024 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)**

श्री दिनु बहादुर पुत्र श्री बल बहादुर, ग्राम निवासी नाओं, डाकघर रूसलाह, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.— 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण करने बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री दिनु बहादुर पुत्र श्री बल बहादुर, ग्राम निवासी नाओं, डाकघर रूसलाह, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत रूसलाह के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थी अब अपना पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत रूसलाह के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है जोकि इस प्रकार है :-

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	दिनु बहादुर	स्वयं	15-03-1999

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिनों के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा सचिव ग्राम पंचायत रूसलाह को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 04-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-

(कुश कुमार),

कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,

नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री कुश कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, नेरुवा,
जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)**

संतोष कुमारी पुत्री श्री लच्छी, ग्राम हुड, डाकघर रूसलाह, तहसील नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.—जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत ग्राम पंचायत रूसलाह के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि के पंजीकरण बारे।

प्रार्थिया संतोष कुमारी पुत्री श्री लच्छी, ग्राम हुड, डाकघर रुसलाह, तहसील नेरुवा ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत रुसलाह के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है तथा प्रार्थिया अब अपना पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत रुसलाह के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है जोकि इस प्रकार है :-

क्रम संख्या	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	संतोष कुमारी	स्वयं	08-12-1995

अतः आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन से 30 दिन के भीतर किसी भी कार्य दिवस पर प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन पत्र पर आवश्यक आदेश पारित करके ग्राम पंचायत रुसलाह को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-03-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / -
(कुश कुमार),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
नेरुवा, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, रामपुर बुशैहर,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा नं० : 35 / 2024

तारीख दायर : 09-12-2024

श्री राजेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र श्री वीर सिंह, निवासी मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)
वादी / प्रथम पक्ष।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

दरखास्त दुरुस्ती हि0 प्र0 भू0 रा0 अ0 37, 38 शजरा नसब दुरुस्ती करने बाबत अराजी खाता खतौनी 45/82, रकबा तादादी 00-22-75 है0, महाल मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

प्रार्थी श्री राजेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र श्री वीर सिंह, निवासी मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) अराजी खाता खतौनी 45/82, रकबा तादादी 00-22-75 है0, महाल मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) जाति दुरुस्ती करने बारे दरखास्त इस अदालत में विचाराधीन है। जिसमें प्रार्थी ने उल्लेख किया है कि उसके स्व0 पिता श्री वीर सिंह कांगड़ा से 50 वर्ष पहले ग्राम मझेवली में रहने आये थे। महाल मझेवली में प्रार्थी की जाति अन्य व उपजाति अन्य दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है प्रार्थी की वास्तविक जाति डूमणा व गोत खावला है जिसे महाल मझेवली में दर्ज कर दुरुस्त करना चाहता है। इसलिए आम जनता को इस सूचना द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि दिनांक 27-05-2025 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन पैरवी मुकद्दमा हेतु हाजिर अदालत आएंगे। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में यह समझा जाएगा कि इस शजरा दुरुस्ती बारा किसी भी प्रकार का एतराज नहीं है तथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 21-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, रामपुर बुशैहर,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा नं0 : 36/2024

तारीख दायर : 09-12-2024

श्रीमती पुष्पा देवी पुत्री श्री वीर सिंह, निवासी मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)
वादी/प्रथम पक्ष।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

दरखास्त दुरुस्ती हि0 प्र0 भू0 रा0 अ0 37, 38 नाम दुरुस्ती करने बाबत अराजी खाता खतौनी 45/82, खसरा नं0 794, 795, कित्ता 2, रकबा तादादी 00-22-75 है0, महाल मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती पुष्पा देवी पुत्री श्री वीर सिंह, निवासी मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) अराजी खाता खतौनी 45/82, खसरा नं0 794, 795, कित्ता 2, रकबा तादादी 00-22-75 है0, महाल मझेवली, तहसील रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे दरखास्त इस अदालत में विचाराधीन है। जिसमें प्रार्थिया ने उल्लेख किया है कि उनका वास्तविक नाम पुष्पा है लेकिन महाल मझेवली में प्रार्थिया का नाम सुषमा देवी दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है इसलिए प्रार्थी महाल मझेवली में सुषमा देवी के स्थान पर पुष्पा देवी दुरुस्त कर दर्ज करवाना चाहती है। इसलिए आम जनता को इस सूचना द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि दिनांक 27-05-2025 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन पैरवी मुकद्दमा हेतु हाजिर अदालत आए। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में यह समझा जाएगा कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारा किसी भी प्रकार का एतराज नहीं है तथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 21-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
रामपुर बुशैहर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती गीता पत्नी श्री गीता राम, निवासी मखडोल, डा0 फागू, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)
वादिया।

आम जनता एवं ग्राम पंचायत मखडोल, तहसील ठियोग, विकास खण्ड ठियोग

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—जन्म/मृत्यु तिथि प्रविष्टि बारा।

इस अदालत में अतिरिक्त जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु शिमला, जिला शिमला के कार्यालय पृष्ठांकन संख्या 573, दिनांक 24-01-2025 के माध्यम से प्राप्त दस्तावेज क्रमशः (1) जिला पंजीकरण (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी पत्र-संख्या एच0एफ0एल0/जन्म एवं मृत्यु/एस0टी0/2025-1-573, दिनांक 24-01-2025, (2) शपथ-पत्र आवेदिका, (3) शपथ-पत्र वाशिन्दगान देह, (4) जन्म रिपोर्ट, (5) अप्राप्यता प्रमाण-पत्र, (6) आधार कार्ड व शपथ-पत्र श्रीमती सुषमा आधार नं0 2301 4795 5298 आयु 35 साल पत्नी विरेन्द्र, वासी कढरव, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश व श्रीमती ममता आधार नं0 9573 8909 9162 आयु 32 वर्ष पुत्री श्री नतीया, वासी मखडोल, डा0 फागू, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0), श्रीमती गीता देवी पत्नी गीता राम, निवासी मखडोल, डा0 फागू, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) अपने पुत्र आरव की जन्म तिथि किन्हीं कारणों से पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने से रह गई है। परिणामतः पंचायत के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में आवेदिका श्रीमती गीता देवी पत्नी श्री गीता राम, निवासी मखडोल, डा0 फागू, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0), अपने पुत्र की जन्म तिथि दर्ज न हुई है जोकि नियमानुसार पंजीकृत होनी अनिवार्य है। इस विषय की पुष्टि शपथ-पत्र व जारी जन्म/मृत्यु रिपोर्ट जो जन्म/मृत्यु अधिकारी शिमला ने अपने आदेश पत्र जो दिनांक 24-1-2025 को जारी हुआ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि श्रीमती गीता देवी पत्नी श्री गीता राम, निवासी मखडोल, डाकघर फागू, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) के पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 17-03-2020 जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 की धारा 13(3) के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत पंचायत के सम्बन्धित अभिलेख अथवा जिला शिमला पंजीकरण (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किये जाने हैं। अगर किसी को इस सम्बन्ध में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अदालत में नोटिस (इशतहार) के जारी होने के एक माह के भीतर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि में आपत्ति न आने की सूरत में आवेदिका श्रीमती गीता देवी पत्नी श्री गीता राम, निवासी मखडोल, डा0 फागू, तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) के पुत्र आरव की जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत सचिव मखडोल को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 14-02-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ठियोग, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

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

1. Sh. Sumit Sharma s/o Sh. Ramesh Sharma, r/o Village Kharaun, P.O. Kohbag, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh age 27 years.

2. Ms. Nishu d/o Sh. Vinod Singh, r/o Village Kufri Dhar, P.O. Ghanahatti, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh age 21 years.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Registration of Marriage under the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.

Sh. Sumit Sharma s/o Sh. Ramesh Sharma, r/o Village Kharaun, P.O. Kohbag, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh and Ms. Nishu d/o Sh. Vinod Singh, r/o Village Kufri Dhar, P.O. Ghanahatti, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of the undersigned stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 06-12-2024 and are living together as husband and wife since then, but the marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriages of Gram Panchayat concerned/ Municipal Coroporation Shimla.

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the General Public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding registration of this marriage, then they can file their objections personally or in writing before this court of undersigned on or before one month of publication of this court notice. After that no objection shall be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court today on 19-04-2025

Seal.

Sd/-

*Additional District Registrar of Marriages-cum-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Rural).*

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

1. Sh. Vishal Gupta s/o Sh. Suresh Pal, r/o Block No. C-25A, Flat No. 14, Vikas Nagar, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh age 35 years.

2. Ms. Geeta Gupta d/o Late Sh. Ravinder Gupta, r/o Mubarkpur, District Mohali, Pb. age 27 years.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Registration of Marriage under the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.

Sh. Vishal Gupta s/o Sh. Suresh Pal, r/o Block No. C-25A, Flat No. 14, Vikas Nagar, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh and Ms. Geeta Gupta d/o Late Sh. Ravinder Gupta, r/o Mubarkpur, District Mohali, Pb. have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of the undersigned stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 12-05-2018 and are living together as husband and wife since then, but the marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriages of Gram Panchayat concerned/ Municipal Coroporation Shimla.

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the General Public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding registration of this marriage, then they can file their objections personally or in writing before this court of undersigned on or before one month of publication of this court notice. After that no objection shall be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court today on 19-04-2025

Seal.

Sd/-

*Additional District Registrar of Marriages-cum-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Rural).*

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

1. Sh. Anurag Bhardwaj s/o Sh. Dharam Chand Bhardwaj, r/o Village Chachiya Pandli, P.O. Junga, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh age 32 years.

2. Ms. Kiran Bala d/o Late Sh. Hem Raj, r/o Village Khatarwar, P.O. Tikkri Minhasa, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh age 29 years.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Registration of Marriage under the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.

Sh. Anurag Bhardwaj s/o Sh. Dharam Chand Bhardwaj, r/o Village Chachiya Pandli, P.O. Junga, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh and Ms. Kiran Bala d/o Late Sh. Hem Raj, r/o Village Khatarwar, P.O. Tikkri Minhasa, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of the undersigned stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 18-04-2024 and are living together as husband and wife since then, but the marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriages of Gram Panchayat concerned/ Municipal Corporation Shimla.

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the General Public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding registration of this marriage, then they can file their objections personally or in writing before this court of undersigned on or before one month of publication of this court notice. After that no objection shall be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court today on 21-04-2025

Seal.

Sd/-

*Additional District Registrar of Marriages-cum-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Rural).*

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Pramila w/o Sh. Bhola Singh, r/o Village Khanash, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Sarahan, Distt. Shimla, H.P. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of her name from "PROMILA SONI" to "PRAMILA" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to change their name as PRAMILA w/o BHOLA SINGH in place of PROMILA SONI they should appear before the undersigned on or before 15-05-2025 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard and name will be corrected accordingly.

Issued today on 16th day of the April, 2025 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal.

Sd/-
(NISHANT TOMAR, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Vijay Wardhan, IAS, Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rohru,
District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Sh. Bhupender Kumar s/o Sh. Nehar Singh, r/o Village Dhagoli, P.O. Kanthili, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

Subject.—Application under section 13 (3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Sh. Bhupender Kumar s/o Sh. Nehar Singh, r/o Village Dhagoli, P.O. Kanthili, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavit in the court of

the undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969, to enter the date of birth of his daughter (Gunjan) 15-07-2012 in the record of Birth Register of Gram Panchayat Dhagoli, Development Block Chhohara.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to enter the date of birth of (Gunjan 15-07-2012) they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 25th April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
(VIJAY WARDHAN, IAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Vijay Wardhan, IAS, Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rohru,
District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Anjana w/o Sh. Sandeep, r/o Village Bhatwari, P.O. Kaloti, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.)
.. Applicant.

Versus

General Public

.. Respondent.

Subject.—Application under section 13 (3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Smt. Anjana w/o Sh. Sandeep, r/o Village Bhatwari, P.O. Kaloti, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavit in the court of the undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969, to enter the date of birth of her daughter (Sonakshi 14-04-2015) in the record of Birth Register of Gram Panchayat Kaloti, Development Block Chhohara.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to enter the date of birth of (Sonakshi 14-04-2015) they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 25th April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
(VIJAY WARDHAN, IAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).

**In the Court of Oshin Sharma (H.P.A.S.), Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Urban),
District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh**

Miss Afia d/o Sh. Firoj Khan, r/o Idgah Colony, Lakkar Bazar Shimla, Teh. & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Miss Afia d/o Sh. Firoj Khan, r/o Idgah Colony, Lakkar Bazar Shimla, Himachal Pradesh has preferred an application to the undersigned for registration of date of birth of his daughter namely AFIA (DOB-17-03-2021) at above address in the record of Municipal Corporation, Shimla.

Therefore, through this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection for entry of date of birth mentioned above, may submit his objection in writing in this court within 30 (Thirty) days from the date of publication of this notice in official Gazette. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on this 25th April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Shimla (Urban), District Shimla (H.P.).

**In the Court of Oshin Sharma (H.P.A.S.), Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Urban),
District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh**

Smt. Meena w/o Sh. Savan Kumar, r/o Garden View Rose Villa, Shahi Haki Building, Near Old Bus Stand, Shimla-1, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh . . Applicant.

Versus

General Public

. . Respondent.

Application under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Smt. Meena w/o Sh. Savan Kumar, r/o Garden View Rose Villa, Shahi Haki Building, Near Old Bus Stand, Shimla-1, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh has preferred an application to the undersigned for registration of date of birth of her daughter namely SONAM (DOB-03-01-2017) at Violet Cottage Near Purana Bus Stand, Shimla in the record of Municipal Corporation, Shimla.

Therefore, through this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection for entry of date of birth mentioned above, may submit his objection in writing in this court within 30 (Thirty) days from the date of publication of this notice in official Gazette. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on this 30th April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Shimla (Urban), District Shimla (H.P.).

**In the Court of Sh. Mohan Sharma, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Kotkhai, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh**

Case No. : 14/2025

1. Sh. Ankush s/o Sh. Ishwari Nand, r/o Karal, P.O. Nagan, Tehsil Kotkhai, District Shimla (H.P.)

2. Smt. Ayushi Thakur d/o Late Sh.Ganga Dutt Verma, House No. 1, Hari Narayan Niwas, Shoghi, Shimla (H.P.)

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Registration of Marriage under H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.

Whereas the above named applicants have made an application of Marriage under H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996 alongwith an affidavit stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 23-06-2023 at r/o Village Karal, P.O. Nagan, Tehsil Kotkhai, District Shimla (H.P.) but this marriage has not been entered in the records of the Registrar of Marriage-cum-Panchayat Secy., Gram Panchayat Nagan and whereas the applicants have prayed for necessary orders for the registration of their marriage.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of the marriage of the above named applicants, they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, either personally or through their authorized agent. In the event of their failure to do so, it would be

deemed that there is no objection to the proposed registration of marriage and orders shall be passed *ex-parte* for the registration of marriage without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 21st day of April, 2025.

Seal.

Sd/-

MOHAN SHARMA (HAS)
Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Kotkhai, District Shimla (H.P.).

ब अदालत श्रीमती तन्जिन डोलमा, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय वर्ग, कुमारसैन, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

प्रकरण संख्या : 02 / 2025

तारीख संस्थापन : 09-01-2025

तारीख अन्तरित आदेश

श्री मनोज कुमार पुत्र स्व0 श्री मोहन लाल, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) Through GPA श्रीमती सुमन पत्नी मनोज कुमार, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

1. श्री सुशील कुमार पुत्र स्व0 श्री मोहन लाल, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 2. श्री सतीश पुत्र स्व0 श्रीमती द्रोपती, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 3. श्री प्यारे लाल पुत्र स्व0 श्रीमती द्रोपती, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 4. श्रीमती शारदा पुत्री स्व0 श्रीमती द्रोपती, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 5. श्रीमती नीना पुत्री स्व0 श्रीमती द्रोपती, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 6. श्रीमती संतोश पुत्री स्व0 श्री दिनू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7. श्री डिन्दू पुत्र स्व0 श्री फन्कू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.1 श्रीमती मुरतू पत्नी स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.2 श्री रामा नन्द पुत्र स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.3 श्रीमती गीता पुत्री नोकी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.4 श्री चुन्नी लाल पुत्र नोकी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.5 श्री प्रेम लाल पुत्र नोकी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.6 श्री गुडडू पुत्र नोकी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.7 श्रीमती सीता पत्नी नोकी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.8 श्री भूपेन्द्र डिन्दू पुत्र स्व0 श्री फन्कू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.9 श्रीमती राजकुमारी पुत्री स्व0 श्री नोकी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री डिन्दू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 7.10 श्रीमती मीना देवी पत्नी श्री रामा नन्द श्री डिन्दू पुत्र स्व0 श्री फन्कू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8. श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8.1 श्रीमती गंगी पत्नी स्व0 श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8.2 श्री सत्य पाल पुत्र स्व0 श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर

जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8.3 श्री ज्ञान चन्द पुत्र स्व0 श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8.4 श्री सरनपत पुत्र स्व0 श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8.5 श्रीमती कला देवी पुत्री स्व0 श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8.6 श्री उमेश पुत्र स्व0 श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 8.7 श्री सुरेश पुत्र स्व0 श्री डुमणू पुत्र श्री नन्दा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 9. श्री दरसू पुत्र श्री सीधू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 10. श्री नाभा पुत्र श्री फन्कू, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 10.1 श्रीमती चमकू पत्नी स्व0 श्री नाभा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 10.2 श्रीमती पदमा देवी पत्नी स्व0 श्री कांशी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री नाभा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 10.3 श्रीमती बबली पुत्री स्व0 श्री कांशी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री नाभा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 10.4 श्रीमती तनू पुत्री स्व0 श्री कांशी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री नाभा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0), 10.5 श्री सोनू पुत्र स्व0 श्री कांशी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री नाभा, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) प्रत्यार्थी।

भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 123(1) के तहत तकसीम हुकमन करने बारे।

दरखास्त तकसीम जेर धारा 123, हि0 प्र0 भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 बाबत अराजी खाता/खतौनी 32/95, ता 99, कित्ता 16, रकबा तादादी 02-27-69 है0, मौजा अहार, पटवार वृत्त कांगल, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

हरगाह आपको सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री मनोज कुमार पुत्र स्व0 श्री मोहन लाल, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) Through GPA श्रीमती सुमन पत्नी मनोज कुमार, गांव आहर, डाकघर जंजैली, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

खाता/खतौनी 32/95, ता 99, कित्ता 16, रकबा तादादी 02-27-69 है0, मौजा अहार, पटवार वृत्त कांगल, तहसील कुमारसैन की हुकमन तकसीम करने बारे इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया था। उक्त तकसीम वाद में क्षेत्रीय अभिकरण द्वारा मौका पर फर्द कब्जा मौका तैयार किया गया। इसके उपरान्त बजरिया समन वादी तथा प्रतिवादी को अदालत में दिनांक 29-01-2025 को बुलाया गया। अदालत में प्रतिवादी नं0 1 व 4 हाजिर हुए परन्तु अन्य कोई भी प्रतिवादी पेश न हुए, इस बारे इशतहार जारी किया गया ताकि किसी मालकान अथवा अन्य को कोई एतराज है, तो वह अपना एतराज इस न्यायालय में प्रस्तुत कर सके। मिसल में आगामी कार्यवाही करने के लिए प्रतिवादीगण को बजरिया समन दिनांक 06-03-2025, 25-03-2025 व 09-04-2025 अदालत में पेश होने के लिए बुलाया गया परन्तु बार-बार समन करने के बाद कोई भी प्रतिवादीगण हाजिर न हुए। इस बारे यदि किसी मालकान अथवा अन्य को कोई एतराज है, तो वह अपना एतराज दिनांक 08-05-2025 को या इससे पूर्व इस न्यायालय में प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की दशा में यह समझा जाएगा कि क्षेत्रीय अभिकरण द्वारा की गई तकसीम प्रक्रिया से आप सहमत व सन्तुष्ट हैं तथा इस वाद का नियमानुसार निपटारा कर दिया जाएगा।

यह आदेश आज दिनांक 09-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित जारी हुये।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
(तन्जिन डोलमा),
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत श्री विष्णु नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता वर्ग-II, कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

बाद संख्या : 14/C/2024

किस्म वाद : दुरुस्ती नाम

तारीख दायरा : 04-12-2024

श्रीमती रेखा श्याम पुत्री स्व० श्री मानसुख पुत्र श्री सीता राम हाल पत्नी श्री मोहन श्याम, निवासी गांव कुमारसैन, डाकघर कुमारसैन, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37, 38 के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

यह प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती श्रीमती रेखा श्याम पुत्री स्व० श्री मानसुख पुत्र श्री सीता राम हाल पत्नी श्री मोहन श्याम, निवासी गांव कुमारसैन, डाकघर कुमारसैन, तहसील कुमारसैन, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) ने दिनांक 03-12-2024 को इस कार्यालय में इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थिया का नाम उसके आधार कार्ड, पैन कार्ड, आयुष्मान कार्ड में रेखा श्याम पत्नी मोहन श्याम दर्ज है जोकि सही है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख खाता नम्बर 26, मोहाल कण्डा, हदबस्त नं० 26, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2020-21, पटवार वृत्त शमाथला, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि० प्र० तथा खाता नम्बर 131, 132, 133, 134 मोहाल उप-महाल शथला, हदबस्त नं० 8/1, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2022-23, पटवार वृत्त थानेधार, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि० प्र० में प्रार्थिया का नाम सुमित्रा पुत्री मानसुख दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। इसलिए प्रार्थिया अब अपना नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में सुमित्रा के स्थान पर रेखा श्याम दुरुस्त/दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रतिवादीगण आम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा हर आम व खास को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में करने बारे किसी को कोई उजर व आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 14-05-2025 तक इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार दुरुस्ती आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत की मोहर सहित जारी हुए।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि० प्र०।

**ब अदालत श्री विष्णु नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता वर्ग-II, कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

वाद संख्या : 7-C/2025

किस्म वाद : दुरुस्ती नाम

तारीख दायरा : 03-04-2025

श्रीमती रमीला देवी पुत्री स्व० श्री प्रेम सुख पुत्र श्री रूप दास हाल पत्नी श्री रोशन लाल, निवासी गांव नून, डाकघर खुन्नी, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37, 38 के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

यह प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती श्रीमती रमीला देवी पुत्री स्व० श्री प्रेम सुख पुत्र श्री रूप दास हाल पत्नी श्री रोशन लाल, निवासी गांव नूण, डाकघर खुन्नी, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) ने दिनांक 24-02-2025 को इस कार्यालय में इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थिया का नाम उसके आधार कार्ड, पैन कार्ड, बैंक पास बुक, परिवार रजिस्टर नकल में रमीला देवी पुत्री प्रेम सुख दर्ज है तथा इसके अतिरिक्त नकल जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2019-20, मोहाल नूण, पटवार वृत्त जरोल, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, के खाता नं० 20 में भी प्रार्थिया का नाम रमीला देवी पत्नी रोशन लाल दर्ज है, जोकि सही है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख खाता नम्बर 4, मोहाल बाजा, हदबस्त नं० 46/1, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2020-21, पटवार वृत्त जरोल, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि० प्र० में प्रार्थिया का नाम मिसी देवी पुत्री प्रेम सुख दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। इसलिए प्रार्थिया अब अपना नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में मिसी देवी के स्थान पर रमीला देवी दुरुस्त/दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रतिवादीगण आम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में करने बारे किसी को कोई उजर व आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 14-05-2025 तक इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार दुरुस्ती आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत की मोहर सहित जारी हुए।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि०प्र०।

**ब अदालत श्री विष्णु नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता वर्ग-II, कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

वाद संख्या : 2-C/2025

किस्म वाद : दुरुस्ती नाम

तारीख दायरा : 20-03-2025

श्री कृष्ण देव पुत्र स्व० श्री लहसनु राम पुत्र मलकू, निवासी गांव मैलन, डाकघर कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37, 38 के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

यह प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती श्री कृष्ण देव पुत्र स्व० श्री लहसनु राम पुत्र मलकू, निवासी गांव मैलन, डाकघर कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) ने दिनांक 24-02-2025 को इस कार्यालय में इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थी का नाम उसके आधार कार्ड, पैन कार्ड, डाकखाना पास बुक, परिवार रजिस्टर नकल में कृष्ण देव पुत्र लहसनु राम दर्ज है जोकि सही है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख खाता नम्बर 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, मोहाल मैलन, हदबस्त नं० 37, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2019-20, पटवार वृत्त कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि०प्र० में प्रार्थी का नाम किशन देव पुत्र लसनू दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है।

इसलिए प्रार्थी अब अपना नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में किशन देव के स्थान पर कृष्ण देव व अपने पिता का नाम लसनू राम के स्थान पर लहसनू राम दुरुस्त/दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः प्रतिवादीगण आम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में करने बारे किसी को कोई उजर व आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 14-05-2025 तक इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार दुरुस्ती आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत की मोहर सहित जारी हुए।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री विष्णु नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता वर्ग-II, कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

वाद संख्या : 1/C/2025

किस्म वाद : दुरुस्ती नाम

तारीख दायरा : 20-03-2025

श्री मनोहर दास पुत्र स्व0 श्री बांकू राम पुत्र श्री मनसू निवासी गांव मैलन, डाकघर कोटगढ़,
उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादीगण।

हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37, 38 के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

यह प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती श्री मनोहर दास पुत्र स्व0 श्री बांकू राम पुत्र श्री मनसू निवासी गांव मैलन, डाकघर कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने दिनांक 24-02-2025 को इस कार्यालय में इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थी का नाम उसके आधार कार्ड, निर्वाचन आयोग पहचान पत्र, बैंक पास बुक, परिवार रजिस्टर नकल व अन्य दस्तावेजों में मनोहर दास पुत्र बांकू राम दर्ज है जोकि सही है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख खाता नम्बर 170, मोहाल मैलन, हदबस्त नं0 37, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2019-20, पटवार वृत्त कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 में प्रार्थी का नाम बनोहर दास पुत्र बांकू दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। इसलिए प्रार्थी अब अपना नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में बनोहर दास के स्थान पर मनोहर दास व अपने पिता का नाम बांकू के स्थान पर बांकू राम दुरुस्त/दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः प्रतिवादीगण आम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा हर आम व खास को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में करने बारे किसी को कोई उजर व आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 14-05-2025 तक इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार दुरुस्ती आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 05-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत की मोहर सहित जारी हुए।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय वर्ग,
उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री विष्णु नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता वर्ग-II, कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बाद संख्या : 12-C/2024

किस्म वाद : दुरुस्ती नाम

तारीख दायरा : 04-12-2024

श्रीमती पुष्पा देवी पुत्री स्व0 श्री मानसुख पुत्र श्री सीता राम हाल पत्नी श्री प्रीतम सिंह, निवासी गांव पुजारली, डाकघर समरकोट, तहसील रोहडू, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37 के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

यह प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती श्रीमती पुष्पा देवी पुत्री स्व0 श्री मानसुख पुत्र श्री सीता राम हाल पत्नी श्री प्रीतम सिंह, निवासी गांव पुजारली, डाकघर समरकोट, तहसील रोहडू, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने दिनांक 03-12-2024 को इस कार्यालय में इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थिया का नाम उसके आधार कार्ड, पैन कार्ड, बैंक पास बुक में पुष्पा देवी पत्नी प्रीतम सिंह दर्ज है जोकि सही है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख खाता नम्बर 26, मोहाल कण्डा, हदबस्त नं0 26, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2020-21, पटवार वृत्त शमाथला, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 तथा खाता नम्बर 131, 132, 133, 134, मोहाल उप-महाल शथला, हदबस्त नं0 8/1, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2022-23, पटवार वृत्त थानेधार, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि0 प्र0 में प्रार्थिया का नाम सरला पुत्री मानसुख दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। इसलिए प्रार्थिया अब अपना नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में सरला के स्थान पर पुष्पा देवी दुरुस्त/दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रतिवादीगण आम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा हर आम व खास को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में करने बारे किसी को कोई उजर व आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 14-05-2025 तक इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार दुरुस्ती आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत की मोहर सहित जारी हुए।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

**ब अदालत श्री विष्णु नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता वर्ग-II, कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

वाद संख्या : 6-C/2025

किस्म वाद : दुरुस्ती नाम

तारीख दायरा : 03-04-2025

श्रीमती किरण भैहक पुत्री स्व० श्री गोपाल दास पुत्र श्री नरेण दास हाल पत्नी श्री संजय भैहक, निवासी गांव ब्रेल, डाकघर कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37 के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

यह प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती श्रीमती किरण भैहक पुत्री स्व० श्री गोपाल दास पुत्र श्री नरेण दास हाल पत्नी श्री संजय भैहक, निवासी गांव ब्रेल, डाकघर कोटगढ़, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि०प्र०) ने इस कार्यालय में दिनांक 22-01-2025 को इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थिया का नाम उसके आधार कार्ड, पैन कार्ड, बैंक पास बुक, परिवार रजिस्टर नकल में किरण भैहक पत्नी संजय भैहक दर्ज है जोकि सही है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख खाता नम्बर 156, 157, 159, मोहाल उप-महाल जरोल, हदबस्त नं० 46/1, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2021-22, पटवार वृत्त जरोल, उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि०प्र० में प्रार्थिया का नाम जुम्मा पुत्री गोपाल दास दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। इसलिए प्रार्थिया अब अपना नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में जुम्मा के स्थान पर किरण भैहक दुरुस्त/दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रतिवादीगण आम जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त नाम दुरुस्ती उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में करने बारे किसी को कोई उजर व आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 14-05-2025 तक इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार दुरुस्ती आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 11-04-2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व अदालत की मोहर सहित जारी हुए।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—

सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला, हि०प्र०।

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

1. Sh. Sushmit Prabhudas s/o Sh. N. Prabhudas, aged 39 years, r/o Bhagwati Niwas, Airpor Road, Lower Totu Shimla, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh .

2. Ms. Raghupatruni Divya aged 33 years d/o Sh. Ramarao, r/o MIG 26m a p h b Colony, Opp. z p Pathasrikakulam (Rural) Srikakulam, Andhra Pradesh.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Notice u/s 5 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Sh. Sushmit Prabhudas s/o Sh. N. Prabhudas, aged 39 years, r/o Bhagwati Niwas, Airpor Road, Lower Totu Shimla, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh and Ms. Raghupatruni Divya aged 33 years d/o Sh. Ramarao, r/o MIG 26m a p h b Colony, Opp. z p Pathasrikakulam (Rural) Srikakulam, Andhra Pradesh have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 5 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 and they have intended to get married within 30 days from the date thereof.

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the General Public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding solemnization of the marriage, then they can file their objections personally or in writing before this court of undersigned on or before 05-06-2025 after that no objection shall be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court today on 05-05-2025.

Seal.

Sd/-
*Marriages Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Shimla (Rural) H.P.*