IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 13838, 13839, 13842, 13843, 13844 and 13846 of 2024
Decided on: 19.12.2024

CWP No. 13838 of 2024

Vivek Thakur and others ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another ... Respondents

CWP No. 13839 of 2024

Sh. Shyam Lal and another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another ... Respondents

CWP No. 13842 of 2024

Kewal Ram Kalta ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

CWP No. 13843 of 2024

Smt. Jyotsna Negi ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another ... Respondents

CWP No. 13844 of 2024

Smt. Nav Pallavi ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another ... Respondents

CWP No. 13846 of 2024

Sh. Pradeep Sharma and others ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another ... Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar Advocate, for the petitioner(s) in all the petitions.
For the respondents	:	Mr. Pushpender Jaswal, Additional Advocate General in all the petitions.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge *(Oral)*

Notice. Mr. Pushpender Jaswal, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the prayer made herein is squarely covered by the judgment passed by Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in CWP No. 2004 of 2017 alongwith connected matters, titled *Taj Mohammad and others vs. State of H.P. and others*, decided on 03.08.2023. He further submits that representations (Annexure P-3 colly.) has also been made by the petitioners in this regard and it would be in the interest of justice, in case, these petitions are disposed of with the direction that let the representations of the petitioners be decided by the Competent Authority, in terms of the averments made in the representations as well as the judgments being relied upon by the petitioners therein.

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

3. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merit of the case, these petitions are disposed of with the direction that let the representations (Annexure P-3 colly.) made by the petitioners shall be decided by the Competent Authority, in terms of the averments made therein, taking into consideration the judgments being relied upon by the petitioners therein, by passing a speaking order, within a period of eight weeks from today.

4. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

December 19, 2024
(*narender*)