



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18247 of 2025
Date of Decision: 26.11.2025

Brij Lal 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: Mr. Vinay Mehta, Advocate.**For the Respondents:** Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Before notices, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioners, on instructions, states that their clients would be content and satisfied in case their pending representation (Annexure P-3) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment dated 07.07.2023 passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.2500 of 2021, titled as **Ranjit Singh and Others Vs. State of H.P. and Others**, along with connected matters, 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 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

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



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-3) 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 Coordinate Bench of this Court in *Ranjit Singh* 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**

November 26, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)