



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18297 of 2025

Date of Decision: 25.11.2025

Smt. Kamla DeviPetitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.Respondents

Coram:

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Babita Chauhan, Advocate.**For the Respondents:** Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocate General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Before notice, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that her client would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment dated 18.12.2018 rendered by Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.2384 of 2018, titled as **State of H.P. and Other Vs. Sh. Matwar Singh and Another**, in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting in appearance on behalf of respondents, fairly states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

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



3. Having perused the averments contained in the petition as well as relief prayed therein vis-à-vis judgment sought to be relied upon, this Court finds that the issue raised in the instant petition already stands adjudicated by Division Bench of this Court and as such, no prejudice would be caused to either of the parties, if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment supra.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of aforesaid judgment expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks from today. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereupon. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if she still remains aggrieved. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 25, 2025
(Sunil)