IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 16365, 16473, 16478 of 2024 to 16484 of 2024

Decided on: 30.12.2024

CWP No. 16365 of 2024

Vijay Kumar … Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16473 of 2024

Latesh Thakur and others … Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16478 of 2024

Pooja and others … Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16479 of 2024

Krishna Kumari and others … Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16480 of 2024

Sanjeev Kumar and others … Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16481 of 2024

Suman Kumari and others … Petitioners

2024:HHC:16643

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16482 of 2024

Sunita Devi and others … Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16483 of 2024

Ravi Dutt … Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another … Respondents

CWP No. 16484 of 2024

Akshay Shoshta and others … Petitioner

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)	:	M/s Parul Negi and Amit Kumar Dhumal, Advocates, 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.

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

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 have 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.

3. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merit of the case, these petitions are disposed of with the direction that let the representations 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 30, 2024
(*narender*)