IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.85 of 2026

Date of Decision: 05.01.2026

Arun Kumar & others .…….Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & another … Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.

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

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Before notice, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioners, on instructions, states that his clients would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to respondents to consider and decide the representation (Annexure P-5) of the petitioners in light of judgment dated 21.03.2024 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No. 2056 of 2023, titled **Ghanshyam Dass and others vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others alongwith connected matters,** in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, while appearing on behalf of respondents fairly states that he is not

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

averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioners.

3. Having perused the averments contained in the petition as well as relief prayed therein vis-à-vis judgment sought to be relied upon, this Court finds that the issue raised in the instant petition already stands adjudicated by this Court and as such, no prejudice would be caused to either of the parties, if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation of the petitioners in light of judgment supra.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation (Annexure P-5) of the petitioners in light of aforesaid judgment expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioners and pass appropriate orders thereupon. Liberty is reserved to the petitioners to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if they still remain aggrieved. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

January 05, 2026
(shankar)