

**THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH
AT SHIMLA**

**RP No.69 of 2025 in CWP
No.9235 of 2024
Decided on: 10.08.2026**

Ranjiv Paul

....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and Ors

...Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vivek Singh Thakur, Judge

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sushil Kukreja, Judge

Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner: Mr.Amit Singh Chandel, Advocate.

For respondents: None for respondents No.1 & 3.

Mr. Raman Sethi, Advocate, for
respondent No.2.

Vivek Singh Thakur, Judge (oral)

This review petition has been preferred by the petitioner against the judgment dated 18.06.2025 passed in main petition **CWP No.9235 of 2024**, titled **Ranjiv Paul vs Union of India & Others**, whereby, the petition has been dismissed on various grounds inter-alia with observations that the petition appears to be a Public Interest Litigation in service matters, whereby GSR No.609(E) dated 22.08.2014 was also assailed along with GSR No.688 (E) dated 26.09.2008, whereas, the

validity of GSR No.609 (E) dated 22.08.2014 has been upheld by the Apex Court.

2. Though, the petitioner had filed an application for amendment of petition by modifying the prayers, especially prayer No.2, seeking direction in his own favour, but even then, the fact would remain that relief has been sought with prayer to quash and set aside GSR No.609 (E) 22.08.2014, the validity whereof has already been upheld by the Apex Court.

3. By filing an application to amend prayer No.2, an attempt has been made to make the petition maintainable by amending the prayer by seeking direction for individual's claim, but by seeking direction to quash Notification GSR No.609 (E) dated 22.08.2014, constitutional validity, whereof, has been upheld by the Apex Court, therefore, there would be requirement of further amendment not only in the prayer clause but in the pleadings of the writ petition also.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also pointed out that in para No.7, it has been mentioned that constitutional validity of Notification dated 22.09.2008 has been upheld by the Apex Court, whereas, the validity of the said Notification has never been assailed before the Apex Court.

5. So far reference of Notification dated 22.09.2008 mentioned in para No.7 of impugned order is concerned, the said mention appears to be a ministerial mistake because para No.7 has to be read in continuity with previous para No.6 of the impugned order, wherein, it has been categorically recorded that constitutional validity of the Notification dated 22.08.2014 was pending adjudication before the Apex Court. Therefore, relevant Notification intended to be referred in para 7 of impugned order is 22.08.2014 but not 22.09.2008.

6. In aforesaid facts & circumstances, we are of the considered opinion that there is no merit in the review petition as there is no error apparent on the face of it except ministerial mistake. However, keeping in view the nature of the claim with respect to pensionary benefits to the petitioner, we are granting liberty to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy for his surviving grievances, if any, as permissible under law, including filing of fresh petition with better particulars and prayer and such petition, if preferred, shall be decided by the appropriate Competent Court on its own merits without being influenced with the dismissal of the present petition as well as CWP No.9235 of 2025 vide judgment

dated 18.06.2025 as writ petition has been dismissed on the technicality/maintainability because of defect in the pleadings as well as in the prayer.

7. Needless to say, the aforesaid order shall also not come in the way of the petitioner to file an appropriate Public Interest Litigation, if so, permissible under the law with better particulars.

Petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms along with pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

(Vivek Singh Thakur)
Judge

(Sushil Kukreja)
Judge

August 10, 2026 (meera)