

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16213 of 2025

Date of Decision: 16.10.2025

Sh. Mohan LalPetitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & OthersRespondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Babita Chauhan, Advocate.

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

Mr. Tek Ram Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Before notice, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that his client would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment dated 18.12.2018 rendered by Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.2384 of 2018, titled as **State of H.P. and Other Vs. Sh. Matwar Singh and Another**, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General and Mr. Tek Ram Sharma, Advocate, while putting in appearance on

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

behalf of respondents, fairly state that they are not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

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 Division Bench of 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 petitioner 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 petitioner in light of aforesaid judgment expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereupon. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if he still remains aggrieved.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

October 16, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)