IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.1491 of 2025
Date of Decision: 31.12.2025

Rekha Kaundal and Another **……...Petitioners**

Versus

Dr. Abhishek Jain and Others **…....Respondents**

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioners: Mr. Bhupinder Thakur and Mr. Shiv Pal Manhans, Advocates.

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

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of present contempt petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioners for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents for their having willfully and intentionally disobeyed the directions contained in order/judgment dated 30.07.2025, rendered in CWP No.12329 of 2025, whereby this Court passed the following order:

> "4. 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 representation of the petitioners (Annexure P-4) in light of Yashwant Kumar (supra), which has not been interfered till date, expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks. Ordered accordingly. In case, petitioners are found to be similarly situate to the petitioner in the aforesaid judgment, they would be extended similar benefits. Needless to say authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioners and pass appropriate orders thereafter. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of."

2. Since despite there being aforesaid direction, no steps, whatsoever, came to be taken at the behest of the respondents for doing the needful, petitioners have approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that though he has every reason to presume that by now, judgment alleged to have been violated must have been complied with in its totality, but if not, same would be positively complied with within a period of four weeks' from today.

4. Consequently, in view of the fair stand adopted by the learned Additional Advocate General, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive and accordingly, same is closed. However, respondents-contemnors are directed to do the needful in terms of judgment alleged to have been violated within a period of four weeks, failing which they would aggravate the contempt and petitioners would be at liberty to get the present petition revived, so that appropriate action in accordance with law is taken against the erring official.

December 31, 2025 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(*Rajeev Raturi*) **Judge**