IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16783 of 2025
Date of Decision: 29.10.2025

Shalley Kharayat ……Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. ….Respondents

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. C.N. Singh & Mr. Anshul Gandhi, Advocates.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Before notice, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that his client would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner in light of judgment dated 23.09.2025 rendered by this Court in CWP No.4971 of 2024, titled as **Nitin Thakur Vs. State of H.P. and Others** along with connected matters, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting in appearance on behalf of respondents, fairly states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

---

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

3. Having perused the averments contained in the petition as well as relief prayed therein vis-à-vis judgment sought to be relied upon, this Court finds that the issue raised in the instant petition already stands adjudicated by this Court and as such, no prejudice would be caused to either of the parties, if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner in light of judgment supra.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner (Annexure P-5 colly) in light of aforesaid judgment expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks from today. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful, in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereupon. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if she still remains aggrieved. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 29, 2025
(Sunil)