

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Civil Writ Petition No.12275 of 2025

Date of Decision: 28.11.2025

Gulshan Kumar and Others**Petitioners**

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Another**Respondents**

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioners: Mr. Dinesh Bhanot, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar,
Additional Advocates General, with Mr. Ravi
Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy
Advocates General, for State.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Though by way of reply to the petition, claim, as put forth by the petitioners, has been refuted by the respondents, but before case at hand could be heard and decided on its own merits, 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 case of the petitioners in light of judgment dated 22.09.2025 rendered by this Court in CWP No.5267 of 2023, titled as ***Uttam Ram and Others Vs. State of H.P. and Others***, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting in appearance on behalf of respondents, fairly states that

he is not 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 case 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 case of the petitioners in light of aforesaid judgment expeditiously, preferably within a period of six 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.

November 28, 2025

Rajeev Raturi

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**