

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.1347 of 2015-E

Date of decision : 28.02.2015

Lalit Sen

... Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Himachal Pradesh and 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. Lalit K. Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. Shrawan Dogra, A.G. with Mr. Ashok Chaudhary & Mr. V.S. Chauhan, Addl. A.Gs. and Mr. Vikram Thakur, Dy. A.G. for the State.

Sanjay Karol, Judge (Oral)

It is seen that petitioner has made a representation dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-3) to the 2nd respondent, 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 the said respondent to decide representation dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-3) expeditiously. The learned Additional Advocate General has no objection to the above request.

3. No other point is urged.

Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

...2...

4. Leaving the questions of law open, a direction is issued to the 2nd respondent/competent authority to consider and decide the petitioner's representation dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P-3), in accordance with law, by affording due opportunity of hearing/ representation to the petitioner, within a period of two weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order. Petitioner is at liberty to place additional material on record. Needless to add, if the order is not in favour of the petitioner, the authority shall assign reasons while deciding the same, which shall be communicated to the petitioner.

With these directions, the petition stands disposed of, so also the pending application(s), if any.

**(Sanjay Karol),
Judge.**

**(P.S. Rana),
Judge.**

February 28, 2015 (KS)