

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.8271 of 2023

Date of Decision: 31.10.2023

Krishan DassPetitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & others ... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Kul Bhushan Khajuria, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. Vishal Panwar and Mr. B.C.Verma, Additional Advocate Generals and Ms. Sunaina, Deputy Advocate General, for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. Chitranjan Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Learned counsel representing the petitioner states that his client would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment dated 31.05.2023 passed by Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.2108 of 2023, titled **Bhagat Ram vs. Himachal Road Transport Corporation and others**, in a time bound manner. Learned Additional Advocate General representing the respondents is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

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

2. Having perused the averments contained in the petition as well as relief prayed therein vis-à-vis judgment sought to be relied upon, this Court finds that the issue raised in the instant petition already stands adjudicated by Division Bench of this Court in the aforesaid judgment and as such, no prejudice, if any, would be caused to either of the parties, if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment supra.

3. Consequently, in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of **Bhagat Ram** supra expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of instant order shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass detailed speaking order thereupon. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if he still remains aggrieved. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 31, 2023
(shankar)