



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18305 of 2025
Date of Decision: 26.11.2025

Savita and Another		Petitioners
	Versus	
State of Himachal Pradesh & Others		Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioners:	Ms. Nandita, Advocate.
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 her clients would be content and satisfied in case their pending representation (Annexure P-2) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment dated 07.04.2025 rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.4830 of 2023, titled as **Inder Singh Thakur and Others Vs. State of H.P. and Others**, in a time bound manner.

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer and order proposed to be passed in the instant petition, this Court sees no necessity to call for the reply from the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General. While accepting

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



notice on behalf of the respondents, learned Additional Advocate General, fairly states that pending representation, if any, filed by the petitioners, shall be decided expeditiously in accordance with law.

3. Having perused averments contained in the petition, which are duly supported by an affidavit vis-a-vis judgment sought to be relied upon, this Court finds that issue raised in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated by this Court in Inder Singh Thakur (supra), as such, there appears to be no impediment in issuing direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioners in light of aforesaid judgment in a time bound manner.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation (Annexure P-2) of the petitioners in light of judgment, as detailed hereinabove, expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. In case, petitioners are found to be similarly situate to the petitioners in the aforesaid judgment, they would be extended similar benefits. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of the instant order shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and pass speaking order thereupon.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 26, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)