

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.7309 of 2025

Date of Decision: 28.11.2025

Seema Devi		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Himachal Pradesh & Others		Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Ms. Prajwal Busta, Advocate, vice Mr. Kush Sharma, Advocate.

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

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Though by way of reply to the petition, claim, as put forth by the petitioner, has been refuted by the respondents, but before case at hand could be heard and decided on its own merits, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that her 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 23.06.2025, passed by this Court in CWP No.8032 of 2021, titled as ***Vikas Kumar Vs. Sate of H.P. and Others***, along with connected matters, in a time bound manner.

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

2. Learned Additional Advocate General fairly states that he is 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 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 three 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 she still remains aggrieved.

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

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 28, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)