IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.15079 of 2025

Date of Decision: 28.10.2025

Vijay Paul .…….Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Another ….Respondents

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Munish Datwalia, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocate Generals and Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, for State.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Before notices, if any, could be issued in the instant proceedings, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that his client would be content and satisfied in case his pending representation (Annexure P-6) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment rendered by Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.6443 of 2021, titled as **Babu Ram Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and Others**, along with connected matters, in a time bound manner.

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer made in the instant petition and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no

---

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

necessity to call for the reply on behalf of the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, who while accepting notice on behalf of the respondents, fairly states that pending representation, if any, filed by the petitioner shall be decided expeditiously in accordance with law.

3. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation (Annexure P-6) of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass detailed speaking order thereupon taking note of the judgment rendered by Division Bench of this Court in Babu Ram case (supra), wherein issue otherwise sought to be decided in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate court of law, if he still remains aggrieved.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 28, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)