

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH
SHIMLA

CWP No.6250 of 2014-E
Date of Decision: 29.08.2014

Sh. Ram SwaroopPetitioner.

Versus

The State of H.P. & others Respondents.

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjay Karol, Judge.

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.S. Rana, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹ No.

For the Petitioner: Mr. A.K. Gupta, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Shrawan Dogra, AG., with Mr. B.S. Parmar, Mr. Anup Rattan, Addl. AGs., Mr. Vikram Thakur and Mr. Puneet Rajta, Dy. AGs., for the respondents-State.

Sanjay Karol, J (oral)

It is seen that petitioner has made a representation dated 03.11.2011 (Annexure P-2) to respondent No.3, bringing out his grievances, which is still pending before the authority concerned.

2. Under instructions, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that petitioner shall be content if a direction is issued to respondent No.3/competent authority to decide representation dated 03.11.2011 (Annexure P-2) expeditiously. Learned Additional Advocate General has no objection to the same.

3. No other point is urged.

4. Leaving the questions of law open, a direction is issued to respondent No.3/competent

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

authority to consider and decide the petitioner's representation dated 03.11.2011 (Annexure P-2), in accordance with law, by affording due opportunity of hearing/representation to the petitioner, within a period of eight weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order. Needless to add, the authorities shall pass a reasoned order, which shall be communicated to all concerned.

With the aforesaid observations, present petition stands disposed of, so also the pending application(s), if any.

(Sanjay Karol),
Judge.

August 29, 2014
(Purohit)

(P.S. Rana),
Judge.