



(Item D-26)

Naresh Sharma vs. Union of India and others

CWPIL No.38 of 2025

30.12.2025

Present: Mr.Ankush Dass Sood, Senior Advocate with Mr.Ajay Siphya and Mr. Tarun Mehta, Advocates for the petitioner.

Ms.Vandna Misra, Central Government Counsel for respondent No.1.

Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr.Pranay Pratap Singh, Additional Advocate General for the respondents-State.

Mr.Raman Ravi Verma, Advocate for respondent No.4.

Perusal of the reply of respondent No.4 would go on to show that against the 36 employees posted against the sanctioned strength of 43, 19 are outsourced employees.

It has also been mentioned that the districts of Solan, Shimla and Sirmaur collectively account for 80% of RERA-registered projects in Himachal Pradesh, whereas, for Kangra, there are only 20 projects, as per Annexure P-14.

Learned Advocate General has tried to rebut the said argument by submitting that District Kangra is sought to be developed and, therefore, the office of RERA has rightly been shifted under a policy decision in order to de-congest Shimla town. We are of the considered opinion that the interim order is likely to continue, keeping in view the number of employees to be shifted to the projects,

which are not even remotely linked to Kangra as it would be a humongous task for the developers as such to firstly co-ordinate with the RERA office at Dharamshala and then with the other offices which give necessary permissions which are placed at Shimla. The number of employees is also minuscule and, therefore, the State can be well advised to shift its larger offices having regular employees rather than targeting the small institutions.

The matter requires consideration.

Admit.

(G.S. Sandhawalia)
Chief Justice

December 30, 2025
(naveen)

(Jiya Lal Bhardwaj)
Judge