

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA.

CWP No. 1101/2017-A

Date of decision: May 30, 2017

Jagdish Kumar	Petitioner
	Versus	
State of H.P. and another		...Respondents

Coram:

The Hon’ble Mr. Justice Sanjay Karol, Acting Chief Justice.

The Hon’ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.

*Whether approved for reporting?*¹ No

For the petitioner : M/s. Bhuvnesh Sharma and Ramakant Sharma, Advocates

For respondent No.1 : M/s. Anup Rattan, Addl. A.G., Varun Chandel, Addl. A.G. and Kush Sharma, Dy.A. G.

For respondent No.2 : Mr. Avnish Bhardwaj, Advocate

Sanjay Karol, ACJ. (Oral)

It is seen that the petitioner has made a request to the competent authority, bringing out his grievances, which is still pending before the authority concerned.

2. Without pressing the petition on merits, learned counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, submits that petitioner shall be content if a direction is issued to the respondent/competent authority to decide the petitioner’s request in the light of the recommendations so made by the authorities (Annexures P6 and P8), in accordance with law. Learned Additional Advocate General has no objection to the same.

¹ Whether the reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

3. No other point is urged.

4. Leaving the questions of law open, a direction is issued to the competent authority to consider and decide the petitioner's request, more so, in the light of Annexures P6 and P8, in accordance with law, by affording due opportunity of hearing/representation to the petitioner, within a period of two months from the date of production of certified copy of this order. 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.

5. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of, so also pending applications, if any.

**(Sanjay Karol),
Acting Chief Justice.**

**May 30, 2017
(rana)**

**(Ajay Mohan Goel),
Judge.**