IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.19517 of 2026

Date of Decision: 30.10.2026

Chane Ram Thakur .…….Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. … Respondents

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Surinder Saklani, Advocate.

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

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, states that petitioner would be content and satisfied in case direction is issued to the respondents to consider and decide his pending representations (Annexures P-4 and P-5), in a time-bound manner.

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer and order proposed to be passed in the instant proceedings, this Court sees no necessity to call for reply from the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General.

3. Precisely, the grouse of the petitioner, as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by Mr. Surinder Saklani, learned counsel for the petitioner, is that repeatedly

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

representations came to be filed at the behest of petitioner for cancellation of Nataur granted in favour of respondent No. 6, for the reason that he is a Government employee and had tendered a false affidavit, but no action is being taken.

4. Though in the instant case, respondent No. 6 has also been arrayed as party respondent, but since this Court does not propose to pass any adverse order against him, rather, he shall also be afforded an opportunity of being heard by the competent authority in terms of the instant order, there is no requirement to issue notice to respondent No.6.

5. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the same with a direction to respondent No. 2 to consider and decide the pending representations of the petitioner (Annexures P-4 and P-5), expeditiously, preferably within a period of two months, in accordance with law. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to petitioner as well as respondent No. 6 and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 30, 2026
(Sunil)