

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16307 of 2025

Date of Decision: 17.10.2025

Anjna DeviPetitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & OthersRespondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. A.K. Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Before notices, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that his 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 rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.3047 of 2020, titled as **Jagdish Kumar and Others Vs. State of H.P. and Others**, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, fairly states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner and case of the petitioner shall be considered and decided in accordance with the aforesaid judgment.

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

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 four 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**

October 17, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)