IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

COPC No.1811 of 2026

IN

CWP No.12896 of 2026

Decided on: 04.11.2026.

Vandna Sharma ....Petitioner

Versus

Devesh Kumar and other ....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. Varun Chandel, Additional Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge

Petitioner has invoked contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the order/ judgment dated 03.08.2026 [Annexure C-1], passed by this Court, in CWP No.12896 of 2026, titled as Vandna Sharma versus State of Himachal Pradesh and other. The Operative part of the order/judgment reads as under:

> "2. This petition is disposed of with the direction that after the adjudication in

---

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

> Letters Patent Appeal by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, which has been preferred by the State against judgment dated 07.04.2025, passed by the Hon'ble Coordinate Bench of this Court in Inder Singh Thakur and others Versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others, the representation of the petitioners be decided by the Authority within 8 weeks as from the date of the adjudication of the Hon'ble Division Bench....."

2. Heard.

3. Notice. Mr. Varun Chandel, Learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the Respondents.

4. Perusal of the order/judgment indicates that Respondent-Competent Authority, was directed to decide the representation of the petitioners, within a stipulated period, from the date of adjudication of Letters Patent Appeal pending before the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Inder Singh Thakur***, referred to in the said order/judgment.

5. Learned State Counsel states that Letters Patent

Appeal in the case of ***Inder Singh Thakur*** is still pending. This fact is also not disputed by Learned Counsel for the petitioners.

6. Considering the matter in above perspective and keeping in view the conditional order/judgment passed on 22.07.2026 [Annexure C-1], this Court, is of the considered view that contempt petition is pre-mature, at this stage, and the same is dismissed accordingly.

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

8. As prayed, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to avail appropriate remedy, in accordance with law, if so desire.

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

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

November 04, 2026
[Anita]