IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No. 882 of 2024
Date of Decision: 21.12.2024

Anjana Kumari **.....Petitioner**

Versus

Ashish Kumar Kohli **.....Respondent**

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioners: Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, learned Additional Advocate General, with Mr. Rajat Chauhan, Law Officer.

Sandeep Sharma, J. ***(Oral)***

By way of instant Contempt Petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent for his having willfully and intentionally disobeyed the directions contained in the order/judgment dated 22.07.2024 passed by Coordinate Bench this Court in CWP No.6807 of 2024, titled as ***Smt. Anjana Kumari Vs. State of HP & Ors.***

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid judgment alleged to have been violated, reveals that this Court having taken note of the statement made by learned counsel representing the petitioners that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered under the judgment dated 03.08.2023 rendered by Division Bench of this Court in **CWP No.2004 of 2017** alongwith connected matters, titled **Taj Mohammad & Ors. Vs. State of HP & Ors.**, disposed of the petition with a direction to the

respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioners, in the light of aforesaid judgment within a period of eight weeks. Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note above, respondent failed to consider the case of the petitioner in light of *Taj Mohammad's case (supra)*, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Learned Additional Advocate General, while accepting notice on behalf of the respondent, states that though he have every reason to believe and presume that by now aforesaid judgment/ order alleged to have been violated, must have been complied with in its totality, but if not, same would be complied with within a period of two weeks from today.

4. Consequently, in view of the fair stand adopted by learned Additional Advocate General, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive and as such, same is accordingly disposed of with the direction to do the needful in terms of judgment, alleged to have been violated positively within a period of two weeks, if not already done, failing which, petitioner would be at liberty to get the present proceedings revived, so that appropriate action, in accordance with law, is taken against erring officials.

December 21, 2024 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
Sunil **Judge**