



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA

CWP No. 10767/2026
Decided on: 02.07.2026

Aman Bibi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

.....Respondents

.....
Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner:

**Mr. Gurinder Singh Parmar,
Advocate.**

For the respondents:

**Ms. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional
Advocate General, for respondents
No.1 to 4.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, J.

Notice confined to respondents No.1 to 4, which is waived
by Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General.

In view of the restricted grievance urged for the petitioner
during the hearing of the case and the order being passed hereinafter,
there is no necessity to issue notice to respondents No.5 to 8. Reply is
also not required to be called for from the appearing respondents. The
matter has been heard accordingly.

2. Petitioner's marriage was solemnized with respondent
No.6, who has allegedly given *Talaq-e-Hasan* to the petitioner. The



petitioner is stated to have taken recourse to legal remedies under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 seeking protection, maintenance and other benefits. She had grievance against Disability Certificate No.401 issued to respondent No.6 on 20.09.2025, certifying him to be suffering from 40% disability (Psychiatry). The said disability certificate was issued by respondent No.5. According to the petitioner, respondent No.6 does not suffer from any disability. She filed a complaint (Annexure P-4) against respondent No.5 for having issued the disability certificate allegedly to a fit person. Cognizance was taken of the aforesaid complaint by the competent authority of the respondents-Health Department by ordering an inquiry into the matter, as is evident from pages No.33-35 of the paper book. Petitioner's grievance is that the aforesaid inquiry is not being taken to its logical conclusion.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, respondents No.1 to 4/competent authority are directed to take the inquiry to its logical conclusion within a time-bound schedule. Learned Additional Advocate General has no objection to the above prayer.

3. In view of the pleadings, documents on record and the restricted prayer of the petitioner, this writ petition is disposed of with directions to respondents No.1 to 4/Competent authority to decide the complaint (Annexure P-4) preferred by the petitioner by taking it to its



logical conclusion, in accordance with law, within six weeks from today.

The order so passed shall be communicated to the petitioner. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

2nd July, 2026 (rohit)