

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

**COPC No. 590 of 2026
Decided on: 23.07.2026**

Rajnish Kumar

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

Rakesh Kanwar and another

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Kunal Verma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Ms. Menka Raj Chauhan, Deputy
Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Petitioner alleges violation of ***Rajnish Kumar***

versus State of Himachal Pradesh & Others² wherein

following operative directions were issued:-

“5. Consequently, In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Needless to say, in the event of petitioner’s being found similar situate to the Kamlesh Chand case (supra), he shall be granted similar benefits expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.”

2. Following order was passed in this contempt petition on 22.07.2026:-

“Respondents in their reply have pleaded having decided the case of the petitioner under a reasoned speaking order dated 24.02.2026, however, no such order has been appended alongwith the reply.

¹Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.

²CWP No.443/2025, decided on 23.12.2025.

Let respondents to place on record order passed by them in compliance to the decision rendered on 23.12.2025 in *CWP No. 443 of 2025 (Rajnish Kumar Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others)*.

List on 23.07.2026.”

During course of today’s hearing, learned Deputy Advocate General has placed on record office order dated 24.02.2026 whereby the respondents considered the case of the petitioner.

The respondents have passed consideration order which inter alia records as under:-

“Whereas, in the present case the petitioner was offered appointment purely on contract basis after the recommendation of the Directorate of Sainik Welfare H.P. at Hamirpur. The petitioner completed the stipulated contract period of two years and the services of the petitioner was regularized vide office order dated 13.12.2022. Hence, the petitioner was already given all the benefits which flows from the said judgment passed in Kamlesh Chand’s case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner has grievance to the aforesaid consideration order. If that is so, it is for the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law for redressal of his surviving grievance.

4. Granting such liberty, the present proceedings are closed. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

July 23, 2026
yogesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge