IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No.151 of 2013 along with COPC Nos.152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160 and 4077 of 2013

Decided on: 31.07.2013

| 1. COPC No.151 of 2013 | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Kuldeep Singh & another | Petitioners. |
| Versus | |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents. |
| 2. COPC No.152 of 2013 | |
| Mukesh Kumar | Petitioner. |
| Versus | |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |
| 3. COPC No.153 of 2013 | |
| Suman Kumar | Petitioner. |
| Versus | |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |
| 4. COPC No.154 of 2013 | |
| Vijay Kumar | Petitioner. |
| Versus | |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |
| 5. COPC No.155 of 2013 | |
| Satwant Singh | Petitioner. |
| Versus | |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |
| 6. <u>COPC No.156 of 2013</u> | |
| Kamal Singh | Petitioner. |
| Versus | ····· ociciono. |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |
| 7. COPC No.157 of 2013 | |
| Rakesh Kumar | Petitioner. |
| Versus | |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |
| 8. COPC No.158 of 2013 | |
| Purshotam Dutt | Petitioner. |
| Versus | ····· ctitioner. |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |
| 9. COPC No.159 of 2013 | |
| | Petitioner. |
| Rajeev Kumar | redidoner. |
| Versus | Doorses |
| Onkar Chand Sharma & another. | Respondents |

10. **COPC No.160 of 2013**

Mukesh KumarPetitioner.

Versus

Onkar Chand Sharma & another. ...Respondents

11. **COPC No.4077 of 2013**

Davinder BhardwajPetitioner.

Versus

Onkar Chand Sharma & another. ...Respondents

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice A.M. Khanwilkar, Chief Justice. The Hon'ble Mr.Justice R.B.Misra, Judge. Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner(s): Mr.Y.P.S.Dhaulta, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr.Varun Chandel, Mr.O.C.Sharma and

Mr. Vimal Kishore, Advocates.

Justice R.B.Misra, J.(oral)

It has been brought to our notice that Himachal Road Transport Corporation is going to provide appointments on contractual basis to the petitioners. To that effect, a letter has been produced before us, which is taken on record.

2. In view of these facts and circumstances, cause of action does not survive, as prayed for by the learned counsel for the respondents-alleged contemnors. However, if petitioners are not satisfied with the appointments given on contractual basis, they may approach before the appropriate forum for appropriate remedy. However, nothing remains to proceed with these contempt petitions, accordingly the same are disposed of.

(A.M. Khanwilkar) Chief Justice

> (R.B.Misra) Judge

July 31, 2013

Whether the reporters of the local papers maybe allowed to see the judgment?