IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No. 1919 of 2026

Date of decision: 18.11.2026.

Rajinder Singh ...Petitioner.

Versus

D.K. Rattan & another ...Respondents.

Coram:

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

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner : Mr. Hemant Kumar Thakur, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Varun Chandel, Additional Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge:

Petitioner has invoked contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the order/judgment dated 18.07.2025 [Annexure C-1], passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, in CWP No. 11491 of 2025, titled as Rajinder Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & another. The operative part of the order/judgment reads as under:-

> "3. Consequently, in view of the aforesaid fair stand adopted by learned Additional Advocate General, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition reserving

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

> liberty to the petitioner to file representation before the competent authority within a period of two weeks for redressal of his grievance, which in-turn, shall be decided by the competent authority, expeditiously, preferably, within a period of four weeks in light of Laxmi Chand (supra). 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 taking note of aforesaid judgment, wherein issue otherwise sought to be decided in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if he still remains aggrieved."

2. Perusal of the order/judgment dated 18.07.2025, [Annexure C-1], indicates that the petitioner was to prefer a representation within two weeks from the date of passing of the order/judgment on 18.07.2025 [Annexure C-1]. Material on record indicates that the petitioner had submitted the representation beyond the period of two weeks on 14.08.2025 [Annexure C-2].

3. Considering the matter in above perspective, since the petitioner had failed to prefer a representation within the stipulated period of two weeks, as mandated in the

order/judgment [Annexure C-1], therefore, in these circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the act of the respondents is not at all contumacious. Moreover, unless and until the petitioner seeks enlargement of time from the Writ Court, therefore, instant petition is not maintainable and is premature.

4. Faced with above situation, Learned Counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawing the instant contempt petition with liberty to move appropriate application for enlargement of time before the concerned Writ Court and thereafter to pursue his remedies in accordance with law. [*Statement Taken on Record].*

5. In above backdrop, instant petition shall stand dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty to the petitioner to take appropriate steps [as in Para-4 of this order], if so desired hereinafter, in accordance with law.

In aforesaid terms, instant petition is disposed of.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

November 18, 2026.
(kck)