IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20741 of 2025
Date of Decision: 30.12.2025

Birbal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Adarsh K.Vashista, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Before notices, 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 his pending representation (Annexure P-7) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment dated 2.5.2012, passed in CWP No. 7602 of 2010, titled as **Om Prakash v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.**, along with connected matter, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, fairly states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner and representation, if any, filed by the

petitioner shall be considered and decided in accordance with the aforesaid judgment

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-7) of the petitioner in light of **Om Prakash** (supra) expeditiously, preferably within a period of four 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. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

December 30, 2025 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(manjit) **Judge**