IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.17725 of 2026

Date of Decision: 06.10.2026

Vijay .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & others ... Respondents

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Hemant Kumar Thakur, Advocate

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

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with non-issuance of Bona-fide Certificate, petitioner, who is Nepali and has been residing in State of Himachal Pradesh, for more than 30 years, has approached this Court in the instant proceedings filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying therein for following main relief:

> **"I. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, thereby directing respondent No.4/the competent authority concerned, to forthwith issue a ' Bonafide Himachali Certificate' in favour of the petitioner, in a time bound manner in light of comprehensive guidelines laid down by this Hon'ble Court in Ashwani Kumar & others vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & others, CWP No. 3517 of 2020, decided on 13.10.2020, upon the petitioner producing/relaying upon the documents annexed with the present writ petition."**

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

2. Before notice in the petition could be issued, learned counsel for the parties fairly admit that issue sought to be raised in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated by the Division High Bench of this Court vide judgment dated 13.10.2020, passed in CWP No. 3517 of 2020, titled **Ashwani Kumar v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.,** and as such, no prejudice would be caused to either of the parties in case respondents are directed to consider and decide case of the petitioner in light of the aforesaid judgment. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to the aforesaid innocuous prayer made by the petitioner.

3. Consequently, in view of the above, present petition is disposed of with direction to the respondents to consider and decide case of the petitioner in light of aforesaid judgment, expeditiously, preferably, within four weeks. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of the instant order shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass detailed speaking order thereupon. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings before appropriate court of law, if he still remains aggrieved. All pending applications stand disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 06,2026
(shankar)