IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.19550 of 2026
Date of Decision: 02.11.2026

Nazeer Mohd.

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?
For the Petitioner: Mr. Arush Matlotia, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the respondents-State.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Precisely, the grouse of the petitioner, as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by Sh. Arush Matlotia, learned counsel for the petitioner, is that representation having been filed by the petitioner in terms of the direction contained in order dated 09.04.2026 passed by this Court in COPC No. 1555 of 2025, titled *Nazeer Mohd. versus Devesh Kumar and Ors.*, is not being decided and as such, he has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

2. Having regard to the nature of the 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 represented by Mr. Ravi Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General.

3. Precisely, the facts of the case, as emerge from the pleadings as well as other material adduced on record by the respective parties, are that petitioner herein approached the respondent-State for providing employment on compassionate grounds on account of death of his father, which was not considered on the ground that petitioner does not possess a matriculation certificate.

4. Petitioner approached this Court by way of CWP No. 7202 of 2021, which was disposed of vide order dated 29.07.2025, thereby issuing direction to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation of the petitioner, but since the needful was not done within the stipulated time, petitioner preferred COPC No. 1555 of 2025, titled *Nazeer Mohd. versus Devesh Kumar and Ors*, which also came to be disposed of vide judgment dated 09.04.2026, thereby reserving liberty to the petitioner to seek an appropriate remedy for redressal of his surviving grievance.

5. Pursuant to the aforesaid order passed by this Court in the contempt proceedings referred to above, petitioner filed representation dated 08.09.2026, enclosing therewith matriculation certificate (Annexure P-9), but since no order has been passed on the representation, he is compelled to approach this Court in the instant proceedings.

6. Sh. Ravi Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General, states that though in past, case of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that he did not possess the requisite qualification for the post in question, but in case, by way of the representation, he has placed on record documents suggestive of the fact that he possesses the requisite qualification, representation preferred by the petitioner shall be decided expeditiously.

7. Consequently, in view of the aforesaid fair stand adopted by learned Deputy Advocate General, 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 ensure that representation dated 08.09.2026 preferred by the petitioner is considered and decided expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks, without being influenced by the disposal of the earlier petition filed by the petitioner, i.e. CWP No. 7202 of 2021. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

November 02, 2026
(sunil)