IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADSH
AT SHIMLA

COPC No. 1624 of 2026
Decided on: 08.10.2026

Prem Singh Shandil ....Petitioner

Versus

Rakesh Kanwar and other ....Respondents

Coram :
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner : Mr. Sparsh Bhushan, Advocate.

For the respondents : Ms. Varun Chandel, Additional Advocate General, for Respondents-State

---

Ranjan Sharma, Judge

Petitioner has invoked the contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the order/judgment dated 26.05.2026 [Annexure E-1], passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP No. 1363 of 2025**, titled as *Prem Singh versus State of Himachal Pradesh & others*. The Operative part of the order/judgment reads as under:

> "4 Be that as it may, in light of the fact that as per learned counsel for the petitioner, persons similarly situated as the petitioner, had been given the benefit of regularization from retrospective date, this petition is disposed of with the direction

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

> that the case of the petitioner be also decided by the Authority in terms of Harsh Gupta's case (supra). In case, the petitioner is found to be similarly situated as the petitioner therein, then appropriate order be passed in the case of the petitioner, in light of Annexure P-4."

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the Respondent/State Authority have not decide the case of the petitioner in terms of the order/judgment referred to above as [Annexure E-1].

3. Heard.

4. Notice. Mr. Varun Chandel, Learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the Respondents.

5. At this stage, Learned Counsel submits that petitioner shall be satisfied, in case, the Respondents-Competent Authority decides the case of the petitioner in a time bound manner. [*Statement taken on record*]

6. Considering the matter in above perspective, this Court directs the Respondent/Competent Authority to decide the matter in terms of the order/judgment within four weeks positively.

7. Needless to say, that in case, the decision is not

taken in terms of the order, petitioner liberty is reserved to seek appropriate remedy.

8. In aforesaid terms, instant petition and all the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

October 08, 2026
(Anita)