

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA 2025:HHC:39848**

Cr.M.P.(M) No. 2714 of 2025

Date of Decision: November 25, 2025

Room Singh Presently lodged in Model Central Jail, Kanda, District Shimla, H.P.	...Petitioner.
---	----------------

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh	..Respondent.
---------------------------	---------------

*Coram:**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vivek Singh Thakur, Judge.**Whether approved for reporting?*

For the Petitioner: Mr.Alok Ranjan, Advocate.

For the Respondent: Mr.Varun Chandel, Additional Advocate General.

Vivek Singh Thakur, J (Oral).

Petitioner has approached this Court under Section 483 Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (in short 'BNSS') seeking bail in case FIR No. 239 of 2021, dated 26.8.2021, registered in Police Station Kullu, District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh, under Sections 302, 307, 323, 325, 326, 201, 147, 148, 149, 440, 354, 354-B, 109 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC'), Section 25 of Arms Act and Sections 3(1)(r), (s), (w) & 3 (2)(va) of Schedule Castes and Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (herein after referred to as SC&ST Act).

2. On behalf of the petitioner, apart from the prayer for enlarging the petitioner on regular bail, prayer for interim bail for 3-4 weeks in peculiar facts and circumstances, narrated in petition, has also been made.



3. Prayer for bail has been made in this petition mainly on the ground of non-appearance/examination of witnesses in the Trial Court, and there is no evidence on record regarding involvement of the petitioner in commission of the offence.
4. Status Report stands filed. Record was also made available.
5. Prosecution case is that on 25.8.2021 at about 7:30 P.M. an information was received in Police Station, Kullu that at near Saeubag at Chhururu, some mishap had occurred. This information was transmitted by Police Station staff to QRT team and to SI Kushal Kumar, the then SHO, who was on patrolling. SI Kushal Kumar, out of his Patrolling Party, deputed ASI Vij Ram and Constable Om Parkash to reach Regional Hospital, Kullu to handle the situation on arrival of injured and alongwith remaining team of Patrolling Party he rushed to spot. On reaching near Café Water Edge (hereinafter referred as Café) at Chhururu, he met Constables of QRT Team of Kullu Police who were controlling the traffic on the spot, managing preservation of the spot and were waiting for Ambulance to shift injured persons from spot. Son of victim Yuma Devi and other onlookers were also present on the spot. Paras Ram was lying in katcha portion of road on side of road. He was bleeding badly and at some distance from him, in the middle of the road, his broken vehicle was there. On left front seat thereof injured Yuma Devi was crying due to pains. SI Kushal Kumar instead of waiting for Ambulance directed QRT Team and son of victim to shift injured



to the Hospital in his Police vehicle. Thereafter on reaching Hospital, treatment of injured was started in emergency. During treatment, statement of Yuma Devi was recorded under Section 154 Cr.P.C. by ASI Vij Ram, on the basis of which FIR was registered under Sections 307, 320, 147, 148, 149 IPC, Section 25 of Arms Act and Section 3 of Schedule Castes and Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

6. Keeping in view serious condition of victims during night, they were referred to Medical College and Hospital, Nerchowk, Mandi. As provisions of SC&ST Act were attracted, therefore, in compliance of communication dated 26.8.2021 issued by Superintendent of Police, Kullu, investigation was transferred to Additional Superintendent of Police, Kullu.

7. As per medical record, following major injuries were found on the person of victim Yuma Devi and Paras Ram.

(a) Yuma Devi.

- "1. Open wound left leg-blunt injury.*
- 2. Lacerated wound left leg-blunt injury.*
- 3. Swelling both arms-blunt injury.*
- 4. Swelling distal phalange both arms-blunt injury.*
- 5. Open wound left thumb blunt injury.*
- 6. Fracture both bone forearm-grievous nature.*
- 7. Fracture left leg-grievous nature."*

(b) Paras Ram:

- "(1) Lacerated Wound (3x2 CM) over frontal region.*
- (2) Bruise (variable size) over right and left shoulder 10x3, 2x1 cm, 5x3 cm.*
- (3) Bruise (10x3 cm) over left shoulder.*
- (4) Open wound over right forearm (3x1 cm, 3x1 cm, 4x2 cm).*



- (5) Open wound over left forearm.*
- (6) Bruise (6x4 cm) over left thigh 9 cm from ASIS.*
- (7) Bruise (5x3 cm over Right thigh 10 cm from ASIS.*
- (8) Open wound (3x1, 4x2, 3x1.5 cm, 4x1) over left leg.*
- (9) Open wound (4x1) cm over right leg.*
- (10) Lacerated wound (6x3 cm) over left arm.*
- (11) Bruise (5x3 cm) over left knee.*
- (12) Bruise (variable size).*
- (13) fracture hank both bone forearm & leg both side."*

8. During investigation statement of Yuma Devi was also recorded on 2.9.2021 in Medical College and Hospital, Nerchowk, wherein she had given detailed statement about dispute and incident with explanation that at the time of recording of previous statement immediately after the attack when she was in Kullu Hospital, she was grievously injured and was under shock and influence of various kinds of drugs/injections administered to her by the doctors, and was in semi-conscious state, and in between her statement was being recorded by the Police and in such state of mind and body she could not narrate the facts of incident properly and completely.

9. Statement of victim has also been recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C. before Judicial Magistrate First Class, Kullu on 9.11.2021. As per prosecution case, as also narrated in the statement of victim Yuma Devi depute had arisen between complainant party and assailants party with respect to sale and purchase of land and a threat was extended by Khimi Ram alias Kewlu to the injured party, whereupon on 23.8.2021 injured party went to Police Station, Kullu, but their FIR was not



registered and they were called on next morning and 2025:HHC:39848 24.8.2021, when they went to Police Station, Kullu, Khimi Ram alias Kewlu was also found summoned there, but he did not come to I.O., but kept on sitting in his vehicle behind the Police Station and when by noon Yuma Devi felt hungry, she alongwith her husband went outside the Police Station to have some eatables. When they reached near District Court Kullu, Khimi Ram came behind them in his vehicle and stopped his Car near the couple and took out a danda from Dickey of his Car, whereas his driver Vijay took out a rod and both of them tried to beat her husband and at that time Sidhu was also accompanying the assailants. Sidhu held her husband, whereas Khimi Ram went on beating him. The moment Vijay tried to give blow to her husband, Yuma Devi rushed and snatched the rod from him and asked to leave her husband, with warning that otherwise she will also hit. By that time, two Policemen also came, one of them caught her husband alongwith Sidhu and Khimi Ram kept on beating her husband. Yuma Devi hit the vehicle of Khimi Ram with rod and cried loudly asking to leave her husband with threat that otherwise she would damage the vehicle. In the meanwhile, Vijay came and snatched the rod from her and slapped her and thereafter Khimi Ram, Policemen and Vijay beat her husband. With fist blow of Khimi Ram, her front tooth was dislocated. Thereafter Police came and scuffle was ended and they went home.



10. On 25.8.2021, they were again called in the Police Station at 10:00 A.M., wherefrom they were sent for medical examination and thereafter they returned back to Police Station, where in front of Additional S.P., Khimi Ram and injured party explained their respective versions. Despite advice of Additional S.P., Khimi Ram did not agree to resolve the dispute and they left the Police Station. Thereafter husband of Yuma Devi received a telephonic call from Raj Kumar, who was with Chander Kiran alias Gaurav, Sidhu, one Advocate and brother-in-law of Khimi Ram for the whole day. Raj Kumar had suggested to resolve the dispute by sitting together, but husband of victim had replied that Khimi Ram did not pay heed to the advice of Additional S.P., therefore, there is least possibility of compromise and had stated that tomorrow they shall meet in Police Station. At 6:00 P.M., Gaurav again called them telephonically and said that incident, which had taken place was not a good thing and asked to resolve the matter by sitting together. By that time, they reached near Water Edge Café, but movement of their vehicle was blocked by parking a Scorpio in the middle of the road and Khimi Ram alias Kewlu, Sidhu, Vijay, brother-in-law of Khimi (Akhil) and other persons came from front side and some persons came from back side and hit their vehicle with stones and when they stopped the vehicle, assailants attacked the couple and husband of complainant was taken to back side of the vehicle and was beaten badly by breaking his foot and causing other injuries and she was also beaten on the seat of vehicle. Assailants tried to



pull her out, but she held the liver of gear with her leg, as such they could not pull her out. They torn her clothes and molested her, apart from breaking her arms and leg.

11. As per prosecution case, after having CCTV Footage of Café, it has been found that assailants were present in café since about quarter to 4:00 P.M. on 25.8.2021 and they were waiting for victims and the moment victims reached there, they stopped their vehicle and attacked them. In CCTV Footage one Ritik was also found present, who has been interrogated intensively and in his statement he has also stated that Khimi Ram, Vijay, Sidhu and Akhil and some other persons unknown to him were present in Café and were discussing about some matter at a side and they were trying to hide something from him. He has also witnessed the incident and had stated that Room Singh was also involved in the attack, with deposition that Room Singh alongwith other accused, namely, Chaman Singh, Akhil, Khimi Ram, Sandhu etc. was hitting the car with Dandas and breaking the glasses/windcreens.

12. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there are contradictions and improvements in the statements of complainant/victim recorded under Section 154 Cr.P.C, 161 Cr.P.C. and 164 Cr.P.C. He has submitted that first version was given by the complainant in Hospital at Kullu, wherein she has not named petitioner as an assailant, rather she has named Chander Kiran @ Gaurav and Raj Kumar as assailants, but during investigation her said version has been found incorrect and



Chander Kiran @ Gaurav and Raj Kumar have been discharged by the Investigating Agency under Section 169 Cr.P.C., as also for that they were not present on the spot, but somewhere else. It has been further submitted that in MLC of injured Yuma Devi, it has been recorded that at the time of medical examination she was conscious, cooperative and oriented to time, place and person and, therefore, her first version was the true version, wherein petitioner has not named him and there is no evidence to connect the petitioner with commission of offence and he has been implicated only on the basis of suspicion as he had filed a petition seeking anticipatory bail.

13. It has further been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that even Yuma Devi has not named petitioner either in her statement recorded under Section 154 Cr.P.C. or Section 164 Cr.P.C. It has been submitted that in the beginning, in his statement, Ritik had stated that he was not knowing other persons except Kewlu, Vijay, Sandhu, Shyama and Akhil, but in later part of his statement, he has named Room Singh as an assailant which is unreliable because when he was not knowing any other person, including Room Singh, then his statement so recorded by the police is also unreliable.

14. It has been further submitted that clothes alleged to be recovered from the petitioner were sent for chemical analysis to Forensic Science Laboratory, but nothing incriminatory was found thereon, like blood and DNA Profiling indicating involvement of petitioner in commission of offence.



15. It has been stated on behalf of petitioner that there was enmity between both the parties and out of enmity petitioner Room Singh being known to main accused Khimi Ram, has been implicated falsely in order to harass and to take revenge, whereas there is no eye witness to substantiate the alleged presence of petitioner Room Singh on the spot.

16. Referring contents of the status report, it has been contended that as per Tower location, Room Singh was found on the spot till 6.59 P.M. Whereas, it is case of the prosecution that incident took place after 7.00 P.M. between 7.04 P.M. and 7.15 P.M. and, therefore, there is no evidence about presence of the petitioner at the time of occurrence of incident on the spot. It has further been stated on behalf of the petitioner that there is no role in delay in the trial on the part of the petitioner, rather it is the prosecution and/or complainant who are responsible for delay in trial as despite service, complainant Yuma Devi is not attending the Court and, therefore, petitioner is entitled for bail.

17. It has been further contended on behalf of petitioner that because of the custody of petitioner, he is not able to look after the well being of his family as the financial condition of family is very weak and his family is in dire stress and therefore, to work out financial stability, petitioner deserves to be enlarged at least on interim bail because his daughter has now been admitted in professional institution namely Rajiv Gandhi Government Engineering College Nagrota Bagwan, District Kangra HP and his son is studying in Trinity School, Kullu and to



continue the study of his children, petitioner intends to make some arrangement and further that prior to arrest, petitioner was running a taxi bearing registration No. HP-01K-4166 which was having fitness certificate clearance upto 7.7.2022 and the said vehicle could not be put to use after lapse of fitness certificate due to detention of petitioner. Therefore, for renewal of requisite licence and permission for running the vehicle there is none other in the family of petitioner. Further that for want of financial arrangements, LIC Policy bearing No. 155008294 for a sum of Rs.25 lacs with half yearly premium of Rs.2779/- has also been discontinued for non-payment of premium in the year 2025 and for revival of the Policy, Life Insurance Corporation had issued a quote whereby the petitioner was called upon to submit his fresh medical report/declaration of good health. However, on applying to the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Kullu to seek permission for medical examination, the Superintendent, Kanda Jail was directed to take the petitioner on 24.10.2025 to the concerned Doctor but petitioner was taken for medical examination on 27.10.2025 on which date Doctor refused to examine the petitioner. Further that apple orchard owned and possessed by the petitioner is also not being managed by the petitioner and petitioner wants to lease out the apple orchard to third party after due negotiations. It has also been contended that petitioner had availed Cash Credit Limit from the Kangra Central Cooperative Bank Limited, Akhara Bazar Branch, Kullu to the tune of Rs.9,50,000/- and the petitioner was repaying the said



loan from time to time but after the arrest of petitioner, business of petitioner has stopped and resultantly, no payment has been made to the Bank resulting into the declaration of Cash Credit Limit as Non Performing Asset (NPA) and initiation of legal process for recovery of outstanding amount in arbitration proceedings at Kullu and therefore, it has been submitted that for all aforesaid works, petitioner deserves to be enlarged on temporary bail if not found entitled for regular bail because there is inordinate delay in conducting the trial which is going at snail pace and there is no likelihood of completion of trial in near future.

18. Petitioner has also placed on record certain documents to substantiate the aforesaid plea.

19. With respect to delay in trial, learned Additional Advocate General, has submitted that charges in present matter were framed against the accused on 13.07.2022, whereafter, six witnesses were called for 13.09.2022 and on that day, statements of four witnesses were recorded and one witness Amarjeet was given up. Whereas, another witness Uday Ram was not present despite service. Thereafter, case was adjourned for 22.10.2022 for recording statements of five prosecution witnesses, but before that, on 13.10.2022 Court file of the case was sent to the High Court as per order passed in Criminal Revision No.490 of 2022, titled as Lekh Raj vs. State of H.P. and, therefore, no witness could be examined on 22.10.2022.



20. Thereafter, for want of record, case was adjourned on 08.12.2022, 12.01.2023, 14.03.2023 and 20.04.2023. Vide order dated 30.05.2023 further proceedings in the case were stayed by the High Court and, thereafter, trial was fixed on 05.07.2023, 09.08.2023, 27.09.2023 and 16.11.2023 for further orders. The case file was received back in the Trial Court on 15.12.2023 whereafter, on 04.01.2024, two witnesses, including complainant Yuma Devi were summoned for 04.03.2024, whereas, other witnesses were summoned for 05.03.2024 and 06.03.2024.

21. On 04.03.2024 Yuma Devi was found admitted in Medical College, Ner Chowk, for treatment and, thus, was not available. At that time, learned counsel for the accused had raised objection that first of all, statement of Yuma Devi be recorded and only thereafter, statements of other witnesses to be recorded. Prayer was accepted by the Sessions Judge and witnesses summoned on 05.03.2024 and 06.03.2024 were discharged and next date for recording statement of Yuma Devi was fixed on 20.04.2024.

22. On 20.04.2024 an Advocate Mr.R.L. Sondhi, appeared on behalf of Yuma Devi and produced prescription slip issued by the Medical Officer, R.H. Kullu, wherein Doctor had prescribed five days medical rest. Therefore, statement of Yuma Devi could not be recorded. On 20.04.2024 matter was adjourned for 22.06.2024 for recording her statement.



23. On 22.06.2024 Presiding Officer was not available on account of transfer and, therefore, matter was adjourned for 04.07.2024.

24. On 04.07.2024 Yuma Devi was summoned for 26.10.2024. On 26.10.2024 for transfer of Presiding Officer, proceedings in the Trial Court could not be progressed and trial was adjourned for proper order on 08.11.2024.

25. Now, complainant has been examined, and case was fixed for recording evidence of four prosecution witnesses on 22.11.2025. On 22.11.2025, three witnesses were present and only two witnesses examined and third witness was discharged as the Court time was over. Now case has been fixed for recording evidence of 9 witnesses on 16.02.2026.

26. Referring aforesaid facts and circumstances, learned Additional Advocate General, submits that there is no delay on the part of the prosecution and summons issued to the witnesses by the Court were duly served upon the witnesses by the police well in time, but unfortunately for the reasons stated supra, statement of the few witnesses only could be recorded, however, he submits that now case has been fixed for recording statements of witnesses on 16.02.2026, and thereafter, statements of other witnesses will be recorded.

27. It has further been submitted by learned Additional Advocate General that statement of other witnesses, apart from complainant Yuma Devi, could have been recorded on earlier dates, who were duly summoned, but due to request made on



behalf of the accused persons through their counsel, statements of other witnesses were also not recorded as complainant was not available on account of her ailment and, therefore, it has been submitted that it is the petitioner and other accused, who are responsible for delay in recording the evidence.

28. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that Criminal Revision No.490 of 2022 was filed by one Lekh Raj, who is not an accused in present case, and in his Revision, order dated 16.07.2022 passed by Special Judge, Kullu, was stayed, but in the trial there is no order dated 16.07.2022 passed by the Special Judge and, therefore, there was no stay in proceeding further in the trial. He has further submitted that as Lekh Raj is not related to the present matter, therefore, there is no question of summoning the record of the present matter by the High Court in a Revision Petition preferred by Lekh Raj.

29. Learned counsel for the petitioner referring order dated 25.11.2024 passed by the Supreme Court in ***Criminal Appeal No.4758 of 2024, titled as Sangram Sadashiv Suryavanshi vs. The State of Maharashtra***, has contended that when there is delay in trial, then rejection of bail with direction to complete the trial in a time bound schedule is unwarranted as an accused is entitled to bail on the ground of long incarceration without the trial making any progress as such direction would be giving a false hope instead of grant of bail for which he is entitled and therefore, in case of delay in trial, option of direction to expedite the trial is not the solution.



30. Learned Additional Advocate General submits that 2025:HHC:39848

Lekh Raj was one of the suspects, who was yet to be interrogated and apprehended, but he was absconding and, therefore, proceedings to declare him proclaimed offender, by invoking provisions under Section 83 and 84 Cr.P.C., were initiated wherein order dated 16.07.2022 was passed in present case FIR No.239 of 2021, dated 26.08.2021 and it is also matter of record that record of the Trial Court was summoned by the High Court in the petition filed by Lekh Raj and, therefore, delay on this count cannot be attributed to the prosecution as immediately after receiving the file, Trial Court as well as prosecution intended to record the statement of witnesses, but for objection of the counsel of the accused persons, recording of statement of witnesses was deferred till recording of statement of Yuma Devi. Therefore, it has been submitted that petitioner is not entitled for bail on the ground of delay, if any in the trial.

31. It has been submitted by learned Additional Advocate General that presence of petitioner in the Cafe has been duly recorded in CCTV and he has been duly identified by the witnesses in the CCTV Camera and had also noticed by the spot witness Ritik on the spot involved in commission of offence. Further that location of the Mobile of the petitioner in the Cafe till 06.59 P.M. cannot be made basis for concluding that petitioner was not present on the spot at the time of commission of offence after 7.04 P.M. as his involvement for other material on record is very much evident. It has further been stated that in any case,



merit of the claim of the petitioner about his absence on the spot at the time of incident is to be evaluated/assessed by the Trial Court after recording of the evidence and on the basis of record, it cannot be said that ex-facie petitioner was not involved at all in the commission of offence because his proximity with other accused, continuous mobile talks with other accused persons during relevant period and presence on the spot is sufficient to establish prima facie that he was involved in commission of offence.

32 Petitioner is an accused in a heinous crime under Section 302 IPC, wherein cold blooded murder has been committed after planning it. It is not a case where a person had expired in a scuffle or on account of an incident taken place for sudden provocation. In this case, it appears that victims were traced, trapped and beaten badly and, injuries are sufficient to draw conclusion that intention of assailants was clear.

33 Earlier bail applications preferred by petitioner bearing Cr.M.P.(M) Nos.1755 of 2021 and 778 of 2022 were dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 14.09.2021 and 19.07.2022 respectively. Vide order dated 16.09.2023 passed in Cr.M.P.(M) No.2346 of 2023, petitioner was enlarged on interim bail on account of death of his father and Cr.MP(M) No. 1787 of 2025 filed by petitioner seeking regular as well as interim bail was dismissed on 10th January, 2025.

34 It has further been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that during period of interim bail granted to the



petitioner, he did not involve in any unlawful activity and he did not defy or violate terms and conditions imposed upon him at the time of grant of interim bail and had surrendered within time before the concerned Jail Superintendent and, therefore, there is no possibility of fleeing from justice by the petitioner, who is permanent resident of Kully having his family at place.

35 Taking into consideration submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Advocate General and also material on record including statements of victim, MLCs of Victim, nature of injuries received by victims, possibility of mental state of Yuma Devi at the time of recording her statement under Section 154 Cr.P.C. and also statement of Ritik and conclusion of investigation but without commenting upon merits of the case, however, taking into consideration parameters and factors required to be taken into consideration at the time of considering bail application, I find that it is not a case where no prima facie case at all is made out against the petitioner. Therefore, I do not find it a fit case for enlarging the petitioner on regular bail at this stage. Accordingly, prayer for regular bail is rejected.

36 On verification of plea advanced for enlarging the petitioner on temporary bail, it has been submitted in the status report that plea of petitioner regarding admission of his children in Engineering College as well as school in Kullu, expiry of fitness of vehicle No. HP-01K-4166 on 7th July, 2022, expiry of Insurance on 13th March, 2021 and expiry of permit on 31.12.2023 and



closure of LIC Policy for want of medical certificate and no 2025:HHC:39848
examination of petitioner on 24.10.2025 as well as 27.10.2025
has been verified to be true. Claim with respect to declaration of
Cash Credit Limit as NPA and ownership of land of petitioner as
claimed in petition has also been found to be correct.

37 Petitioner is not a convict and, therefore, he is not
entitled to seek temporary release on parole or furlough under
The Himachal Pradesh Good Conduct Prisoners' (Temporary
Release) Act, 1968 and therefore, it has been contended that
petitioner has no other remedy except to file present petition to
seek his temporary enlargement so as to enable him to manage
the affairs regarding which even a convict would have been
entitled in peculiar facts and circumstances of present case.

38 Taking into consideration entire facts and
circumstances, petitioner is directed to be enlarged on
temporary bail from the date of furnishing bail bonds, till 6th
January, 2026, on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.1 lac
with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of Trial
Court and also subject to any other condition considered to be
proper to be imposed by the Trial Court amongst following
conditions:-

- 1. He shall surrender before the Jail Superintendent/Incharge of concerned Jail on or before 6th January, 2026 at or before 3 PM, wherefrom he shall be released.*
- 2. He shall not tamper with evidence in any manner.*



- 3 *He shall not visit any of the place except his native village or any other place where his presence is required to enable him to manage the household affairs;*
4. *That petitioner shall not misuse his liberty in any manner.*
5. *That the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence. He shall not, in any manner, try to overawe or influence or intimidate the prosecution witnesses;*
6. *That the petitioner shall not obstruct the smooth progress of trial;*
- 7 *That the petitioner shall not jump over the bail and shall inform, in writing, regarding change of address, land line number and/or mobile number, if any, in advance, to concerned Police Station;*

39 Copy of this order also be transmitted to the concerned Trial Court for information and compliance.

40 Jail Authorities are directed to report the matter on surrender or failure to surrender on 6th January, 2026 to the trial Court, whereupon, trial Court as well as other concerned officers, in case of failure to surrender, shall take appropriate action against petitioner as well as his surety.

41 The petitioner is permitted to produce copy of order downloaded from the High Court website and the trial Court shall



not insist for certified copy of the order, however, they may verify the order from the High Court website or otherwise.

Petition stands disposed of.

(Vivek Singh Thakur),
Judge.

November 25, 2025
(ms)