



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.10841 of 2025

Date of Decision: 08.07.2025

Rakesh Kumar & Ors. Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. ... Respondents

Coram:

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

For the Petitioners: Mr. Vinay Mehta, Advocate.**For the Respondents:** Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. B.C. Verma, Additional Advocate Generals with Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Before reply, if any, from the respondents could be received, learned counsel representing the petitioners, on instructions, states that the petitioners would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation (**Annexure P-12**) of the petitioners, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. B.C.Verma, leaned Additional Advocate General, while putting appearance on behalf of the respondents, fairly states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioners.

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



3. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation **(Annexure P-12)** of the petitioners expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks from today. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and pass appropriate orders thereafter. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

July 08, 2025
(Sunil)