

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.7031 of 2025

Date of Decision: 30.04.2025

Santosh KumarPetitioner
 Versus
 State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. ... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.Whether approved for reporting? ¹**For the Petitioner:** Mr. Adarsh K.Vashista, Advocate.**For the Respondents:** Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. Vishal Panwar & Mr. B.C. Verma, Additional Advocate Generals, with Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents-State.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Before the case at hand could be heard and decided on its own merit, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that the petitioner would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide is pending representation (**Annexure P-4**), in a time bound manner.

2. Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting appearance on behalf of the respondents, fairly states that representation, if not already decided, shall be decided expeditiously.

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

3. Consequently, in view of above, this Court without going into the merits of the case deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation **(Annexure P-4)** of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereupon. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

April 30, 2025
(Sunil)