IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

COPC No.1698 of 2026

IN

CWP No.17091 of 2025

Decided on: 26.10.2026

Anupam Sharma .....Petitioner

Versus

Rakesh Kanwar and others ....Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner: Ms. Mamta Garg, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Sumit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge

Petitioner has invoked contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the order dated 04.11.2025 *[Annexure C-1]*, passed by this Court, in ***CWP No.17091 of 2025,*** titled as *Archana and others versus State of H.P. and others alongwith connected matters.* The Operative part of the order reads as under:-

> "3. Petitioners' grievance is that their representations dated 05.10.2025 (Annexure P-4) seeking applicability of ***Mohit Sharma & Anr.***

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

Versus State of H.P. & Ors. have not been decided till date by the respondents/competent authority. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners would be content in case the respondents/competent authority(s) are directed to consider and decide the aforesaid representations in accordance with law within a fixed-time schedule. Learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to this prayer.

4. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matters, these writ petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representations of the petitioners dated 05.10.2025 (Annexure P-4) in accordance with law as well as taking into consideration the above judgment in the case of ***Mohit Sharma*** within a period of six weeks from today. The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioners."

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that neither the representation(s) *[Annexure P-4 annexed with the said Writ Petition]* have been decided nor a speaking order has been conveyed to as yet.

3. Heard.

4. Notice. Mr. Sumit Sharma, Learned Deputy Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. *At this stage,* Learned Counsel for the

petitioner prays that Respondents may be directed to implement the order dated 04.11.2025 *[Annexure C-1]* in a time bound manner. Prayer being innocuous, is not opposed by Learned State Counsel also.

6. Considering the matter in above perspective and as prayed by Learned Counsel for the petitioner, instant petition is closed, with a direction to the Respondents to decide the representation(s), by passing a speaking order and to convey the decision *[if not already conveyed],* within five weeks from today.

7. Notices issued to the respondents shall stand discharged, accordingly.

8. Needless to say that in case the order passed by this Court, is not complied with, the petitioner is free to seek appropriate remedy, in accordance with law.

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

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

October 26, 2026
[Bhardwaj]