

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20748 of 2025

Decided on: 08.07.2026

Bimla Devi

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others.

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Pawan K Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General
with Mr. Rajat Chaudhary, Assistant
Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Despite grant of repeated opportunities,
respondents have not filed the reply. The matter has
accordingly been heard at this stage.

2. The grievance of the petitioner was noticed as
under in the order passed on 30.12.2025:-

*“Notice. Mr. L.N. Sharma, learned Additional
Advocate General, appears and waives service of
notice on behalf of the respondents.*

*Petitioner rendered 20 years of service from
1984 to 2005 as Anganwari Worker and 09 years &
07 months of service as Supervisor. Learned counsel
for the petitioner submits that there was delay in*

¹Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.

petitioner's regular appointment as Supervisor. The delay was attributable to the respondents. Petitioner cannot be penalized for that reason and debarred from pension, there being shortfall of two months in the qualifying service required for the purpose of pension. Let the respondents file reply to the writ petition within four weeks.

List thereafter."

3. The case set up by the petitioner is that she was employed as Anganwari Worker during the year 1983-84 at Anganwari Centre Narola, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. Respondents issued an advertisement for the post of Supervisor (ICDS-Integrated Child Development Services). Written examination was held on 19.01.2003. Petitioner appeared in the examination. It was more than two years later i.e. in the year 2005, that petitioner was called for interview on 28.05.2005. Petitioner appeared in the interview and was declared qualified for the post of Supervisor. On 31.05.2005, petitioner was given regular appointment as Supervisor. Petitioner is stated to have joined as such on 31.08.2005. Petitioners retired on 31.03.2015 after rendering 9 years and 7 months of regular service. Petitioner's grievance is that respondents have not sanctioned pension under the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules 1972, in her favour in view of her service

short by 2 months from the requisite 9 years and 9 months.

Learned counsel for the petitioner urges that had the respondents declared the result of the examination conducted for the post of Supervisor in time, petitioner would have been issued appointment order much earlier and she would have also joined at a prior date which would have enabled her to complete the requisite service of 9 years and 9 months to become eligible for grant of pension.

4. In view of the facts placed on record and the there being no reply from the respondents, in the given circumstances, this writ petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2/Competent Authority to look into the grievance of the petitioner in accordance with law and the attending facts and circumstances. Appropriate order be passed on the grievance of the petitioner within six weeks from today after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also to stand disposed of.

July 8, 2026
R.Atal

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge