IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16697 of 2025 a/w
CWP No.16149 of 2025,
CWP No.16694 of 2025,
CWP No. 17110 of 2025,
CWP No.17268 of 2025,
CWP No.18829 of 2025,
CWP No.958 of 2026,
CWP No.959 of 2026,
CWP No.2085 of 2026

Decided on: 03.11.2026

CWP No.16697 of 2025

Amit Kumar Gupta & others ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

CWP No.16149 of 2025

Smt. Deep Shikha & another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

CWP No.16694 of 2025

Anil Kumar Vashist & others ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

CWP No.17110 of 2025

Dinesh Kumar & others ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

CWP No.17268 of 2025

Smt. Savita Sharma & others ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

CWP No.18829 of 2025

Ramesh Chand & another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

CWP No.958 of 2026

Man Mohan Sharma … Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others … Respondents

CWP No.959 of 2026

Ram Kishan & another … Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others … Respondents

CWP No.2085 of 2026

Satish Kumar … Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others … Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Yogesh Jaswal, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner(s):	Mr. Suneel Awasthi, Advocate, in all the petitions.
For the respondents:	Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Additional Advocate General, for the respondent-State, in all the petitions.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral)

By way of these petitions, the petitioners have, *inter alia*, assailed the final Seniority List (Annexure P-7). This List has been assailed by the petitioners without assailing the tentative Seniority List, which has culminated into the issuance of the final Seniority List.

2. This Court called upon the learned Counsel for the petitioners on previous dates to intimate the Court, as to whether any of the petitioners had filed any objections against the tentative Seniority List. Learned Counsel for the petitioners fairly submitted that this was not done by any of the petitioners. However, he submitted that the reason

---

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

why the petitioners did not file any objections against the tentative Seniority List was because, as the tentative Seniority List was issued pursuant to a judgment passed by this Court, therefore, they were of the considered view that no purpose was going to be served by filing any objection.

3. We are of the considered view that once the petitioners had not filed objections to the tentative Seniority List, then the petitioners cannot maintain the petitions, assailing the final Seniority List.

4. At this stage, learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners be allowed to withdraw these petitions as they intend to challenge the very judgment which was the basis of the issuance of the Seniority List (Annexure P-7).

5. The petitions are dismissed as withdrawn, so also pending miscellaneous application(s), if any. As far as the liberty prayed for by the petitioners is concerned, the petitioners may pursue such remedies as may be available to them under law, subject to all just exceptions.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

(Yogesh Jaswal)
Judge

November 03, 2026
(Rishi)