



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18293 of 2025

Date of Decision: 26.11.2025

Muneer MohammadPetitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & OthersRespondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Rajat Kumar, 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 petitioner, on instructions, states that his client would be content and satisfied in case his pending representation (Annexure P-2) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.1638 of 2024, titled as **Mohit Sharma and Another Vs. State of H.P. and Others**, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General, fairly states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner and representation, if any, filed by the

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



petitioner shall be considered and decided in accordance with the aforesaid judgment

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-2) of the petitioner 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 petitioner and pass detailed speaking order thereupon taking note of the judgment rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in Mohit Sharma case (supra), wherein issue otherwise sought to be decided in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if he still remains aggrieved.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 26, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)