

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA.

**CWP No. 2843 of 2019 with CWP Nos. 4189 of 2019,
CWP Nos. 877, 1097, 1267, 1268, 1269 1316, 1317, 1321, 3810 4343,
4824, 4973, 4974, 4975, 4976, 4977, 4978, 6284 of 2020
CWPOA Nos.3074, 3081, 3090, 3486, 4674, 5697, 6410, 6415, 6418,
6424, 6447, 6452, 7373 of 2020
CWP Nos. 1262 of 2021 and CWP No. 4066 of 2023**

Decided on: September 29, 2023

-
- | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | CWP No. 2843 of 2019 | |
| | Rajender Kumar and others | Petitioners |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 2. | CWP No. 4189 of 2019 | |
| | Indu Bala | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 3. | CWP No. 877 of 2020 | |
| | Raj Kumar | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 4. | CWP No. 1097 of 2020 | |
| | Navjot Kumar | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 5. | CWP No. 1267 of 2020 | |
| | Sandeep Kumar | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 6. | CWP No. 1268 of 2020 | |
| | Sunil Kumar | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 7. | CWP No. 1269 of 2020 | |
| | Sushma Kumari | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 8. | CWP No. 1316 of 2020 | |
| | Neena Devi | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-------------|
| 9. | CWP No. 1317 of 2020
Sanjay Kumar | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 10. | CWP No. 1321 of 2020
Satya Devi | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 11. | CWP No. 3810 of 2020
Amit Kumar | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 12. | CWP No. 4343 of 2020
Mangeshwar Singh | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 13. | CWP No. 4824 of 2020
Harvinder Kumar | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 14. | CWP No. 4973 of 2020
Sarita Devi | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 15. | CWP No. 4974 of 2020
Susheela Devi | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 16. | CWP No. 4975 of 2020
Bhupinder Azad | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 17. | CWP No. 4976 of 2020
Shweta Chauhan | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 18. | CWP No. 4977 of 2020
Satish Chauhan | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. | Respondents |
| 19. | CWP No. 4978 of 2020 | | |

- | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|--------|-------------------|
| | Reema Kumari | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 20. | CWP No. 6284 of 2020 | | |
| | Manoj Kumar | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 21. | CWPOA No. 3074 of 2020 | | |
| | Man Chand and others | | Petitioners |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 22. | CWPOA No. 3081 of 2020 | | |
| | Alu Devi | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 23. | CWP No. 3090 of 2020 | | |
| | Navjot Kumar | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 24. | CWPOA No. 3486 of 2020 | | |
| | Kailash Chand | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 25. | CWPOA No. 4674 of 2020 | | |
| | Suksham | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 26. | CWPOA No. 5697 of 2020 | | |
| | Narinder Thakur | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 27. | CWPOA No. 6410 of 2020 | | |
| | Rashpal Singh | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 28. | CWPOA No. 6415 of 2020 | | |
| | Shashi Kumar | | Petitioner |
| | | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 29. | CWPOA No. 6418 of 2020 | | |
| | Sanjeev Kumar | | Petitioner |

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Versus | |
| | State of Himachal Pradesh and others | .. Respondents |
| 30. CWPOA No.6424 of 2020 | | |
| Krishan Mohan Sharma and another | | Petitioners |
| | Versus | |
| State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 31. CWPOA No.6447 of 2020 | | |
| Kikar Singh | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 32. CWPOA No. 6452 of 2020 | | |
| Vaibhav Kachhawa | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 33. CWPOA No. 7373 of 2020 | | |
| Dhian Chand | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 34. CWP No. 1262 of 2021 | | |
| Nasib Chand | | Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |
| 35. CWP No. 4066 of 2023 | | |
| Jagat Ram and others | | Petitioners |
| | Versus | |
| State of Himachal Pradesh and others | | .. Respondents |

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Mehar Chand Thakur, Advocate in CWP No. 2843 of 2019 and CWP No. 4066 of 2023.

Mr. Vikas Rajput, Advocate in CWP Nos. 4189, 877, 3810 of 2020, CWPOA Nos. 4674, 6410, 6415 and 6418, 6424, 6447 and 737 of 2020.

Mr. Sanjeev Bhushan, Senior Advocate with Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate, in CWP No. 1097 of 2020.

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

Mr. Sarthak Mehta, Advocate in CWP Nos. 1267-69, 1316, 1317, 1321, 4824, 4973-78, 6284 of 2020.

Mr. Vijay Chaudhary, Advocate in CWPOA Nos. 3074 and 3081 of 2020.

Mr. Digvijay Singh, Advocate in CWPOA No. 3090 of 2020.

Mr. Naresh K. Sharma, Advocate in CWPOA No. 3486 of 2020.

Mr. Suneet Goel, Advocate in CWPOA No. 5697 of 2020.

Ms. Anubhuti Sharma, Advocate in CWPOA No. 6452 of 2020.

Mr. Bhuvnesh Sharma, Senior Advocate with Mr. Parav Sharma, Advocate in CWP No. 1262 of 2021.

For the respondents : Mr. Anoop Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. Vishal Panwar and Mr. B.C. Verma, Additional Advocates General & Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Ms. Sunaina, Deputy Advocates General, for the respondent-State, in all the petitions.

Mr. Nimish Gupta, Advocate, for the Rogi Kalyan Samiti, in all the petitions.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Since common questions of facts and law are involved in all these cases, they were heard together and are now being disposed of vide common judgment.

2. Learned counsel for the parties state that the dispute raised in the instant petitions, has been adjudicated by this Court in case **Anant Ram & Ors. v. State of H.P. and others**, CWPOA No. 1660 of 2020,

decided on 15.6.2023, as such, petitioners would be content and satisfied in case a direction is issued to the respondents to consider and decide cases of the petitioners in light of aforesaid judgment.

3. Learned General is not averse to the aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioners.

4. Having taken note of the issue raised in the petitions vis-à-vis judgment relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioners, this court finds that the issue has been adjudicated by this Court in **Anant Ram**, supra, as such no prejudice would be caused to either of parties, in case a direction is issued to the respondents to consider and decide the cases of the petitioners in light of **Anant Ram**, supra.

5. Consequently, in view of above, present petitions are disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioners, expeditiously, preferably within a period of twelve weeks from today, in light of **Anant Ram** supra. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of this order, shall afford opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and pass a speaking order thereafter. Liberty is reserved to the petitioners to file appropriate proceedings, before appropriate court of law, if they still remain aggrieved.

6. All the petitions stand disposed of in the afore terms, alongwith all pending applications.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

September 29, 2023
Vikrant