

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.1119 of 2025

Date of Decision: 17.10.2025

---

Ranjana Nayyar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Kamlesh Kumar Pant & others

... Respondents

---

Coram:

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.**

Whether approved for reporting? <sup>1</sup>

---

**For the Petitioner:** Mr. Rajender Sharma, 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 respondents for their having intentionally and deliberately disobeyed the mandate contained in the judgment/order dated 23.07.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No. 11767 of 2025 titled **Ranjana Nayyar 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 within a period of three weeks. Since,

---

<sup>1</sup>Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note hereinabove, respondents 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 respondents to do the needful in terms of judgment/order dated 23.07.2025, positively within a period of three weeks, if not already done, failing which, they 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. Notices issued to the respondents are hereby discharged accordingly.

**(Sandeep Sharma),  
Judge**

October 17, 2025  
(shankar)