**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH
AT SHIMLA**

COPC No.1689 of 2026

IN

CWP No.15292 of 2026

Decided on: 26.10.2026

Rajesh Kumar and others .....Petitioners

Versus

Rakesh Kanwar and others ....Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioners: Mr. Vivek Thakur, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Gautam Sood, Deputy Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge

Petitioners have invoked contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the order dated 07.09.2026 *[Annexure C-1],* passed by this Court, in ***CWP No.15292 of 2026,*** titled as *Rajesh Kumar & Ors. versus State of H.P. & Ors.* The Operative part of the order reads as under:-

> "2. Petitioners' grievance is that their respective representation(s) annexed with these writ petitions, seeking applicability ***Inder Singh Thakur & Ors. Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.*** have

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

> not been decided till date by the respondents/ competent authority. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners would be content, in case, respondents/competent authority are directed to consider and decide the aforesaid representations of the petitioners, in accordance with law, within a time bound manner. Learned Additional Advocate General has no objection to this prayer.
>
> Having regard to the above submissions, but without examining the merits of the matters, these writ petitions are disposed of by directing 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....."

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that neither the representations *[annexed with the said Writ Petition]* have been decided nor a speaking order has been conveyed to them as yet.

3. Heard.

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

5. *At this stage,* Learned Counsel for the petitioners prays that Respondents may be directed to

implement the order dated 07.09.2026 *[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 petitioners, instant petition is closed, with a direction to the Respondents to decide the representations, by passing a speaking order and to convey the decision *[if not already conveyed],* within six weeks from today. Notices issued to the respondents shall stand discharged, accordingly.

7. Needless to say that in case the order passed by this Court, is not complied with, the petitioners are 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]