



**Thakur Dwara Shri Narsingh Ji Mandir and  
others vs. State of H.P. and others**

**CWPIL No. 115 of 2026**

[Item S-8 ]

**07.10.2026 Present:**

Mr. Ankush Dass Sood, Sr. Advocate, with Ms. Ambika Kotwal, Mr. Ajay Sipahiya and Mr. Tarun Mehta, Advocates, for the petitioners.

Mr. Arsh Rattan, Depute Advocate General, for respondents No. 1 to 11/State.

*Inter alia*, contends that the land measuring 41 Bighas 10 Biswas situated in Mauza Dadi Bhola, which forms part of a total area of 1730 Bighas 12 Biswas, belongs to the Deity (Petitioner No. 1). An effort was made to exchange the land with respondent No. 12 (Kuldeep Kaur) vide exchange deed dated 24.07.2017 (Annexure P-3). Initially, Mutation No. 1413 (purported to be Mutation No. 1417, as per judgment) was sanctioned in favour of the said respondent on 26.07.2017 (Annexure P-4). Subsequently, the said mutation was cancelled on 16.04.2018 on the ground that the land belonged to the temple. Resultantly, respondent No. 12 filed a suit for declaration against the LRs of one deceased Mohatamim Ganga Ram (who had executed the exchange deed) and Thakur Dass, who were sons of Dharam Dass, based on the earlier exchange deed and challenging the cancellation of Mutation No. 1413 dated 16.04.2018. The State was not arrayed as a party, and only the general public was arrayed as Respondent No. 1. Thereafter, the private respondents filed a written statement admitting the claim and stating that the mutation had been cancelled without assigning any reasons. It is submitted that the suit has now been decreed on 26.10.2024 (Annexure P-10) without going

through the documents, including the entry made in the revenue records, which had been duly executed, and a finding has been recorded that the plaintiff had stated that she had no knowledge as to why the mutation was cancelled, while placing reliance upon the registered exchange deed. It is thus submitted that the order itself is not sustainable.

It is further pointed out that now Mutation No. 1843 was sanctioned on 28.04.2025 (Annexure P-13), and specifically it has been averred that the land has to be used for a residential town planning layout as per the site plan which has been appended as Annexure P-11.

Reference has also been made to the pleadings in the suit, wherein it has been alleged that the land of the Deity is slanted, uneven, banjar, and unfit for cultivation, whereas the land owned by the plaintiff is plain, cultivable, irrigated, and situated adjoining the industrial area, and the market value of the land is more. It is submitted that the position is rather vice versa, and the Deity has been put to loss by giving land of lesser value and, as per the written statement, it has been mentioned that the welfare of the Deity is to be protected by those who can take better care of the land in question.

Notice. Mr. Arsh Rattan, learned Deputy Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 11. On taking steps within one week, issue notice to respondents No. 12 to 19, returnable for 10<sup>th</sup> December, 2026.

In the meantime, the State shall ensure that status quo regarding land in question is maintained and there is no

development activity carried out on it. It is the personal responsibility of the Deputy Commissioner, Solan, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate (SDM), Nalagarh, and official respondents No. 6 and 7 to ensure compliance, failing which contempt proceedings shall be initiated against the said officers.

The record of the said Civil Suit be also called for by the office. Relevant documents, referred to above, be placed on record, duly translated, by counsel for the plaintiff.

**(G.S. Sandhawalia)**  
**Chief Justice**

**(Bipin C. Negi)**  
**Judge**

07<sup>th</sup> October, 2026  
(Tarun Singh)