IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.1780 of 2026

Date of Decision: 02.11.2026

Arun Kumar .....Petitioner

Versus

Ms. Priyanka Verma & another ... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the Petitioner: Ms. Babita Chauhan, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant contempt petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents for their having intentionally and deliberately disobeyed the mandate contained in judgment/order dated 18.09.2025 passed Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No. 15028 of 2025 titled **Shri Arun Kumar vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others.**

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid order/judgment, alleged to have been violated, reveals that Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, while disposing of the petition, directed the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of six weeks. Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful,

[1] *Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

as taken note hereinabove, respondents failed to do the needful, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General representing the respondents, states that though he has every reason to believe and presume that by now aforesaid judgment/ order alleged to have been violated, must have been complied with, but if not, same would be complied with within a period of two weeks from today.

4. Consequently, in view of the fair statement made by learned counsel for the respondents, this Court sees no reason to keep the present proceedings alive and accordingly, same are closed with the direction to the respondents to do the needful in terms of judgment/order dated 18.09.2025, positively within a period of two weeks, if not already done, failing which, they would further aggravate the contempt. Petitioner is at liberty to get the present proceedings revived in case aforesaid judgment is not complied with, so that appropriate action, in accordance with law, is taken against the erring officials. Notices issued to the respondents are hereby discharged accordingly.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

November 02, 2026
(shankar)