IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20793 of 2026 alongwith connected matters

Decided on: 23rd November, 2026

---

1. CWP No.20793 of 2026

Brij Bala **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

2. CWP No.20794 of 2026

Santosh Kumar **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

3. CWP No.20799 of 2026

Sewa Ram **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

4. CWP No.20826 of 2026

Kumari Suman and others **.....Petitioners**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

5. CWP No.20856 of 2026

Anil Sharma and another **.....Petitioners**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

6. CWP No.20867 of 2026

Vipan Kumar **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

7. CWP No.20885 of 2026

Lalit Kumar Hirawal **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

8. CWP No.20888 of 2026

Simsa Devi **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

9. CWP No.20890 of 2026

Lachhman Ram **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

10. CWP No.20897 of 2026

Sonika Devi **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

11. CWP No.20916 of 2026

Naresh Thakur and others **.....Petitioners**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioners: M/s Pankaj Thakur, Vinod Chauhan, Yogesh Kumar Chandel, Ajeet Singh Saklani and Surila Sangam, Advocates, in the respective petitions.

For the Respondents: Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta and Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional Advocates General with Ms. Seema Sharma, Deputy Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. L.N. Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

---

[1] **Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.**

2. Petitioners' grievance is that their representations (annexed with the respective writ petitions) seeking applicability of ***Inder Singh Thakur & Ors. Versus State of H.P. & Ors.***[2] 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.

3. 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 in accordance with law as well as taking into consideration the above judgment within a period of six weeks from today. The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioners.

---

[2] CWP No.4830 of 2023, decided alongwith connected matter on 07.04.2025

The writ petitions stand disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

November 23, 2026
Mukesh