SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Register's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPSS No.1517/2026, **WPSS No.1518/2026,** **WPSS No.1519/2026,** **WPSS No.1520/2026,** **WPSS No.1521/2026,** **WPSS No.1522/2026,** **WPSS No.1523/2026,** **WPSS No.1524/2026,** **WPSS No.1525/2026,** **WPSS No.1526/2026,** **WPSS No.1527/2026 and** **WPSS No.1528/2026** **Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.** Mr. Devang Dobhal, Advocate, for the petitioners. Mr. Pradeep Hairiya, Additional CSC with Mr. B.S. Koranga, learned B.H. for the State. (2) Since the issue involved in all these writ petitions is identical, therefore, these are being heard and decided together by this common judgment. However, for brevity, facts of Writ Petition (S/S) No.1517 of 2026 alone are being considered and discussed here. (3) Petitioner was appointed as Pharmacist in Ayush Deparment of the State on 8.6.2006. Since benefit of Old Pension Scheme has not been given to him, therefore, he has filed this writ petition. (4) Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that vacancies on the post of Pharmacist in Ayush Deparment were not advertised between 1991 to 2000; on 30.9.2000, State of U.P. advertised 550 vacancies on the said post, however due to State reorganisation, selection process could not be brought to its logical end and after creation of State of Uttarakhand, vacancies were re-advertised on 29.11.2005. It is contended that since the vacancies

were old and the advertisement was also issued in 2005, therefore, candidates, who had applied pursuant to earlier advertisement issued in 2000, were given age relaxation in the subsequent selection, held in 2005. Learned Counsel thus contends that anyone who was appointed in 2006, pursuant to selection which was held in 2005, is entitled to benefit of Old Pension Scheme. Reliance is placed on Government Order dated 07.11.2023 in support of this contention.

(5) Learned State Counsel submits that petitioner has sought a writ of mandamus and he has also made representation, therefore he has no objection if the competent authority is asked to take decision thereupon.

(6) Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner be permitted to make fresh representation highlighting his grievance.

(7) Writ petitions are, accordingly, disposed of by permitting the petitioners to make fresh representation. If petitioners make such representation within ten days from today, decision thereupon shall be taken, as per law, within four months thereafter by passing a speaking and reasoned order.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
10.06.2026

R.Dang