**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH**
**SHIMLA**

COPC No. 1612 of 2026

Date of decision: 07.10.2026.

Daljit Singh ...Petitioner.

Versus

Ashish Kumar Kohli ...Respondent.

**Coram:**

**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge.**

*Whether approved for reporting?*[1]

For the petitioner : Ms. Rinkle, Advocate vice Mr. Balwant Singh Thakur, Advocate.

For the respondent : Mr. Gautam Sood, Deputy Advocate General.

**Ranjan Sharma, Judge:**

Petitioner has invoked the contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance to the order/judgment dated 10.03.2025 [Annexure C-1], in CWP No. 3241 of 2025, titled as *Daljit Singh versus State of Himachal Pradesh and another.* Operative part of the order reads as under:-

> "4. Consequently, in view of above, present petition is disposed of by directing the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of Taj Mohammad supra, within a period of six weeks. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful

[1] ***Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes***

> in terms of this order, shall afford opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass a speaking order thereafter. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate court of law, if he still remains aggrieved."

**2.** Learned Counsel for petitioner submits that State Authorities have neither considered nor decided the case of the petitioner in light of the judgment in the case of Taj Mohammad vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & others [CWP No. 2004 of 2017], within the stipulated period of six weeks and no opportunity of hearing has been given and even speaking order has not been passed/conveyed to the petitioner as yet.

**3.** Heard.

**4.** Notice. Mr. Gautam Sood, Learned Deputy Advocate General, waives service of notice on behalf of the respondent.

**5.** At this stage, Learned Counsel for petitioner submits that the petitioner shall be satisfied in case State Authorities are directed to implement the judgment dated 10.03.2025 [Annexure C-1] expeditiously. (Statement taken on record].

**6.** Prayer, being innocuous, is not opposed by Learned State Counsel also.

**7.** Considering the matter in the above perspective, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to the State Authorities/Respondents to comply with the judgment dated 10.33.2025 (Annexure C-1) by deciding the claim after affording an opportunity of hearing and by passing a speaking order [if not already passed and conveyed], within a period of six weeks positively,

**8.** In aforesaid terms, the instant proceedings are closed and notice is discharged.

**(Ranjan Sharma)**
**Judge**

7th October, 2026.
(kck)