IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20496 of 2025 and connected matters.
Decided on: 29.12.2025

---

1. CWP No.20496 of 2025

Dharam Lata **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

2. CWP No.20514 of 2025

Pawan Sharma **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

3. CWP No.20536 of 2025

Shikha Sharma **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

4. CWP No.20538 of 2025

Hushan Chand **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

5. CWP No.20540 of 2025

Praveen Kumar **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

6. CWP No.20614 of 2025

Manoj Kumar **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

7. CWP No.20616 of 2025

Ambika Rani **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

8. CWP No.20618 of 2025

Saroj Kumari **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

9. CWP No.20624 of 2025

Kamal Krishan **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

10. CWP No.20626 of 2025

Thakur Dutt **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

11. CWP No.20628 of 2025

Sarika Sharma **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

---

12. CWP No.20634 of 2025

Satish Kumar **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Ors **.....Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioners: Mr. Mukesh Sharma and Mr Vipin Sharma, Advocates.

For the Respondents: Mr. L.N.Sharma, Additional Advocate General.

---

[1]**Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. L.N.Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matters are heard at this stage.

3. Petitioners' grievance is that their representations, annexed with the respective writ petitions, seeking applicability of ***Mohit Sharma & Anr. Versus State of H.P. & Ors.***[2] have not been decided till date by the respondents/competent authority. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners would be content in case the respondents/competent authority(s) are directed to consider and decide the aforesaid representations in accordance with law within a fixed-time schedule. Learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to this prayer.

4. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matters, these writ petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representations of the in accordance with law

---

[2] CWP No.1638 of 2024, decided on 29.11.2024

as well as taking into consideration the above judgment in the case of ***Mohit Sharma***[2] within a period of six weeks from today. The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioners.

The writ petitions stand disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

December 29, 2025
R.Atal