IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA.

COPC No.281 of 2020
Decided on 30.12.2020

Sh. Harminder Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Sandeep Bhatnagar and Anr. Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge
Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the petitioner	**:**	Mr. Shivendra Singh, Advocate, through Video Conferencing.
For the respondents	**:**	Ms. Shyam Singh Chauhan, Advocate, through Video Conferencing.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

By way of present contempt petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents for having willfully and intentionally disobeyed the directions contained in judgment dated 17.10.2019, passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP No. 2915 of 2019, whereby the Division Bench of this Court having taken note of the statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that his case is squarely covered by the judgment dated 17.7.2014, passed by this Court in CWP No. 3050 of 2014, titled *Nek Ram v. State of HP and Ors.*, disposed of the petition with direction to the

[1] *Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

respondents/competent authority to consider the case of the petitioner in light of aforesaid judgment and thereafter, grant similar benefit to him in case he is found to be similarly situate within a period of three months from the date of production of copy of the order/judgment. Since no action, whatsoever, came to be taken at the behest of the respondents pursuant to aforesaid direction issued by the Division Bench of this Court, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

2. Mr. Shyam Singh Chauhan, Advocate, while accepting the notice on behalf of the respondents, submits that though he has every reason to presume that by now, judgment alleged to have been violated must have been complied with in its totality, but if not, same would be positively complied with within a period of six weeks from today.

3. Consequently, in view of the fair stand adopted by the learned counsel for the respondents, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive and accordingly, same is closed. However, respondents-contemnors are directed to do the needful in terms of judgment alleged to have been violated within a period of six weeks, failing which they would aggravate the contempt and petitioner would be at liberty to get the present petition revived so that

appropriate action in accordance with law is taken. Notices issued to respondents are discharged at this stage.

30th December, 2020 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
manjit **Judge**