IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No. 1803 of 2026

Date of decision: 03.11.2026.

ARuna Gupta ...Petitioner.

Versus

Devesh Kumar & others ...Respondents.

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

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 04.08.2026 [Annexure C-1], passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, in CWP No. 12910 of 2026, titled as Aruna Gupta versus State of H.P. & others. The Operative part of the order/judgment reads as under:-

> "2. This petition is disposed of with the direction that after the adjudication in Letters Patent Appeal by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, which has

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

> 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 petitioner be decided by the Authority within eight 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 petitioner, 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 petitioner.

6. Considering the matter in above perspective and keeping in view the conditional order/judgment passed on 04.08.2026 [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 petitioner 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 03, 2026.
(kck)