

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

CWP No. 15957 of 2026.

Decided on : 14th September, 2026

Bhupinder Singh Thakur

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner:

Mr. A.K. Gupta, Advocate.

For the respondents:

Ms. Seema Sharma, Deputy Advocate
General for respondents No.1 & 2.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Notice, at this stage, confined to respondents No.1 and 2 only. Ms. Seema Sharma, learned Deputy Advocate General appears and waives service of notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2-State.

2. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matter has been heard at this stage without calling for the reply. Petitioner's representation seeking rectification of alleged anomaly in his salary was turned down by the respondents on 06.02.2025 as under:

"In this regard, it is informed that the pay anomaly has arisen due to Dr. Bhpinder Singh Thakur, Principal was awarded 3 advance increments for Ph.D. on 03.09.2008 in the pay scale 15600-39100+AGP 8000, whereas Dr. Jagat Pal Singh, Principal was awarded 3 advance increment for Ph.D. on 29.03.2013 in

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

the pay scale 37400-67000+AGP 9000. As per Note-6 below sub rule 07 of HPCS (RP) Rules, 2009 and Rule 9 (2)(iv) of HPCS (RP) Rules 2022 cannot be considered as pay anomaly."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that subsequent to the respondents rejecting petitioner's case, similar issue as involved in petitioner's case was adjudicated upon in ***Smt. Ruchi Ramesh vs. State vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others***², wherein the benefit as claimed by the petitioner in the instant petition was allowed to the petitioner in the aforesaid petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner would be satisfied in case he is permitted to make a fresh representation to the respondents with directions to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner afresh for the redressal of his grievances in light of *Ruchi Ramesh (supra)* within a fixed-time schedule.

4. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents/ competent authority that in case such a representation is so made within two weeks from today, the same shall be decided by the competent authority in accordance with law as well as taking into consideration the above judgment within a period of six weeks

² CWP No.8052 of 2024 decided on 25.03.2026.

thereafter. The order so passed shall also be communicated to the petitioner. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

14th September, 2026.
(jai)