

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

CWP No.269/2016

Decided on : 28.1.2016

M/s Raman KumarPetitioner
Versus

State of H.P. and ors.Respondents

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dharam Chand Chaudhary, Judge.

*Whether approved for reporting?*¹ No

For the petitioner: Mr. Ajay Vaidya, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Virender Verma and Mr. M.L. Chauhan, Additional Advocate Generals.

Dharam Chand Chaudhary, J (oral):

This writ petition is filed with the following prayers:-

- a) Pass an appropriate writ, order or direction for above stated actions of respondents amounting to executive inaction owing to which petitioner is suffering irreparable losses, mandate may kindly be issued thereby directing the respondent No.2 to decide the representation (Ann. P-13) after affording the personal hearing to the petitioner, in time bound manner.
- b) Any other appropriate order or directions that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be issued in favour of the petitioner.

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

2. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner would feel content if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to decide the representation (Annexure P-13) in a time bound manner. This Court feels that no prejudice is likely to be caused to the respondent-State in case the writ petition is disposed of at this stage itself with a direction to the second respondent to decide the representation (Annexure P-13) in a time bound manner. The representation (Annexure P-13) was submitted by the petitioner long back on 8.9.2015. In view of there being financial implications involved, respondent No.2 should have otherwise decided the representation by this time. Anyhow, respondent No.2 is now directed to decide the representation (Annexure P-13), after affording an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner, within four weeks from the date of production of a copy of this judgment by the petitioner before the said respondent. The petitioner would be at liberty to seek appropriate remedy in accordance with law in the event of the decision taken by respondent No.2 on the representation (Annexure P-13) goes against him. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

28th January, 2016
(pankaj)

(Dharam Chand Chaudhary)
Judge