

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.1113 of 2025

Date of Decision: 17.10.2025

Sunil Dutt SharmaPetitioner

Versus

Sh. Ashish Kohli ... Respondent

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Ravinder Singh Chandel, Advocate.

For the Respondent: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant contempt petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent for his having intentionally and deliberately disobeyed the mandate contained in the judgment/order dated 22.03.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No. 10753 of 2023 titled **Sunil Dutt vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others.**

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid order/judgment, alleged to have been violated, reveals that this Court, while disposing of the petition, directed the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner in light of judgment passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWPOA No. 5536 of 2020, titled **Sanjay Kumar vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others**, within a

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

period of six weeks. Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note hereinabove, respondent failed to do the needful, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General representing the respondent states that though he has every reason to believe and presume that by now aforesaid judgment/ order alleged to have been violated, must have been complied with, but if not, same would be complied with within a period of three weeks from today.

4. Consequently, in view of the fair statement made by learned Additional Advocate General, this Court sees no reason to keep the present proceedings alive and accordingly, same are closed with the direction to the respondent to do the needful in terms of judgment/order dated 22.03.2025, positively within a period of three weeks, if not already done, failing which, he would further aggravate the contempt. Petitioner is at liberty to get the present proceedings revived in case aforesaid judgment is not complied with, so that appropriate action, in accordance with law, is taken against the erring officials. Notice issued to the respondent is hereby discharged accordingly.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

October 17, 2025
(shankar)