

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

**COPC No.1237 of 2025
Date of Decision: 27.11.2025**

Rakesh Chand	Versus	Petitioner
Sh. Rakesh Kanwar and Another		Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Munish Kumar, 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, J. *(Oral)*

By way of present 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 order/judgment dated 28.08.2025, rendered in CWP No.13871 of 2025, whereby this Court passed the following order:

“3. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner (Annexure P-2) in light of Mohit Sharma (supra), expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks from today. Ordered accordingly. 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 speaking order thereafter. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.”

2. Since despite there being aforesaid direction, no steps, whatsoever, came to be taken at the behest of the respondents for doing the needful, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that though he has every reason to 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.

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

November 27, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**