IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.1112 of 2025

Date of Decision: 17.10.2025

Om Anand & another .....Petitioners

Versus

Sh. Ashish Kohli ... Respondent

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.

For the Respondent: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant contempt petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioners for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent for his having intentionally and deliberately disobeyed the mandate contained in the judgment/order dated 20.06.2025 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No. 9888 of 2025 titled **Om Anand and others vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others.**

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid order/judgment, alleged to have been violated, reveals that Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, while disposing of the petition, directed the respondents to consider

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

and decide the representations of the petitioners within a period of six weeks. Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note hereinabove, respondent failed to do the needful, petitioners have approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General representing the respondent states that though he has every reason to believe and presume that by now aforesaid judgment/ order alleged to have been violated, must have been complied with, but if not, same would be complied with within a period of three weeks from today.

4. Consequently, in view of the fair statement made by learned Additional Advocate General, this Court sees no reason to keep the present proceedings alive and accordingly, same are closed with the direction to the respondent to do the needful in terms of judgment/order dated 20.06.2025, positively within a period of three weeks, if not already done, failing which, he would further aggravate the contempt. Petitioners are at liberty to get the present proceedings revived in case aforesaid judgment is not complied with, so that appropriate action, in accordance with law, is taken against the erring officials. Notice issued to the respondent is hereby discharged accordingly.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 17, 2025
(shankar)