

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.1350 of 2026

Date of Decision: 18.09.2026

Ashok Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Narender Kumar

... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Ms. Salochna Rana, Advocate,.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar,
Additional Advocate Generals with Mr. Ravi
Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy
Advocates 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 judgment/order dated 04.09.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No. 14261 of 2025 titled **Ashok Kumar 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 take final decision within six weeks upon the application submitted by the petitioner for compassionate appointment on account of death of his father, who had admittedly died in 2014. Since, despite there being specific

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

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 two 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 04.09.2025, positively within a period of two 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**

September 18, 2026
(shankar)