

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16091 of 2025

Date of Decision: 15.10.2025

Chaman Lal and AnotherPetitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & AnotherRespondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioners: Mr. Tarun K. Sharma and Mr. Ranbir Rathore, Advocates.

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

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Before notices, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioners, on instructions, states that his clients would be content and satisfied in case their pending representation (Annexure P-6) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment rendered by Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.54 of 2013, titled as **State of H.P. and Others Vs. Om Prakash**, decided on 04.10.2019, along with connected matter, in a time bound manner.

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer made in the instant petition and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity

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

to call for the reply on behalf of the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, who while accepting notice on behalf of the respondents, fairly states that pending representation, if any, filed by the petitioners shall be decided expeditiously in accordance with law.

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 pending representation (Annexure P-6) of the petitioners expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and pass detailed speaking order thereupon taking note of the judgment rendered by Division Bench of this Court in *Om Prakash* case (supra), wherein issue otherwise sought to be decided in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated. Liberty is reserved to the petitioners to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if they still remain aggrieved.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

October 15, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)