



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18271 of 2025

Date of Decision: 26.11.2025

Hazara Singh		Petitioner
	Versus	
HRTC and Others		Respondents

Coram:

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vikas Rajput, Advocates.**For the Respondents:** Mr. Vinod K. Gupta, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Before reply, if any, could be received on behalf of 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-3) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment dated 17.07.2014, passed by Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.3050 of 2014, titled ***Nek Ram Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and Others***, 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. Vinod K. Gupta, Advocate, who fairly

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



states that pending representation, if any, filed by the petitioner shall be decided expeditiously in accordance with 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-3) 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 Division Bench of this Court in Nek Ram 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)