



2025:HHC:40073

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.1224 of 2025

Date of Decision: 26.11.2025

Sh. Satish Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Devesh Kumar & Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Ganesh Barowalia, 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 the respondents-State.**

Mr. Tara Chand Chauhan, Advocate, for respondent No.3

Sandeep Sharma, J. (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 willfully and intentionally disobeyed the directions contained in the order/judgment dated 05.09.2025, rendered in CWP No.14357 of 2025, titled as **Satish Kumar Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.**, whereby this Court, while disposing the writ petition filed by the petitioner, directed the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation of the petitioner within four weeks in light of judgment rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.105 of 2021 titled as



Daulat Ram Rana Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Since despite there being aforesaid direction, no steps, whatsoever, came to be taken at the behest of the respondents for doing the needful, petitioners have approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

2. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, while accepting notice on behalf of the respondents, states that though he has every reason to believe and presume that by now, judgment, alleged to have been violated, must have been complied with in its totality, but if not, same would be positively complied with within a period of three weeks from today.

3. Consequently, in view of the fair stand adopted by learned Additional Advocate General, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive and accordingly, same is closed. However, respondents are directed to do the needful in terms of judgment, alleged to have been violated within a period of three weeks from today, failing which, they would aggravate the contempt and petitioners would be at liberty to get the present petition revived so that appropriate action in accordance with law is taken against the erring officials. Notice issued to the respondents is discharged.

November 26, 2025

(Sunil)

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**