

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.17130 of 2026

Decided on: 06.10.2026

Anuradha Dhiman	... Petitioner
Versus	
State of Himachal Pradesh and others	... Respondents

Coram

Hon’ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.

Hon’ble Mr. Justice Yogesh Jaswal, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner:	Mr. Vishwa Kriti, Advocate.
For the respondents:	Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No.1 to 3. Mr. Manohar Lal Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral)

By way of this petition, the petitioner has, *inter alia*,
prayed for the following reliefs:-

- “Issue a writ in the nature of certiorari, mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, declaring the cut-off date prescribed in the existing Regularization Policy of the State Government bearing Letter No. EDN(TE)B(1)2/2015-II dated 03.10.2015 to be arbitrary, discriminatory, and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, to the extent that it excludes the Petitioner and other identically placed long-serving employees from the benefit of regularization, and striking down/reading down the said cut-off date to that extent;*
- b) Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, commanding the Respondents to frame an appropriate policy for the regularization of the Petitioner’s category of employees, and/or to suitably extend or modify the existing*

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

2026:HHC:41909

Regularization Policy by removing or relaxing the impugned cut-off date, so as to bring within its fold the Petitioner and other identically placed employees who have rendered long, continuous service against posts of perennial nature;

c) Consequent upon prayers (a) and (b) above, issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents to regularize/absorb the services of the Petitioner against the post of Data Entry Operator at Respondent No. 3-College, or any other suitable equivalent post, directly under Respondent No. 2/Respondent No. 3, with all consequential and monetary benefits flowing therefrom;

d) Alternatively, and without prejudice to the prayers aforesaid, issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents to continue the Petitioner in service without any break, interruption, or disengagement, treating her as an employee for all intents and purposes of Respondent No. 2/Respondent No. 3, irrespective of any change in the implementing/outsourcing/third-party agency (NIELIT or otherwise) through which her engagement has hitherto been routed;

e) Pending hearing and final disposal of the present writ petition, pass an ad-interim/interim order restraining the Respondents from disengaging, removing, replacing, or in any manner discontinuing the services of the Petitioner from the post held by her, and direct that the Petitioner be continued in service and be paid her wages/salary regularly and without interruption.”

2. Having heard learned Counsel for the petitioner, we are of the considered view that the present petition is misdirected, for the reason that the petitioner does not has any locus to assail the

2026:HHC:41909

Regularisation Policy dated 03.10.2025, issued by the Government, which stands quoted in Para-9 of the petition which related to the taking over of services of teaching and non-teaching employees engaged on contract basis through Student Welfare Fund, Institute Management Committees and other schemes upto 31.07.2015.

3. The petitioner in the present case was not engaged as on the date when the said Policy came into force and he, in fact, was engaged on outsource basis through NIELIT in terms of Annexure P-1 dated 21.03.2017.

4. Faced with this situation, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner be allowed to withdraw this petition, but with liberty to approach the Court afresh on the ground of regularisation of the services of the petitioner as per the concerned Policy of the State.

5. Petition is allowed to be withdrawn with liberty as prayed for, on the ground of regularisation of the petitioner in light of the current Policies of the State Government in vogue.

6. The petition stands disposed of, so also pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

(Yogesh Jaswal)
Judge

October 06, 2026
(Rishi)