IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 10226/2024
Decided on: 31.12.2024

Anita Dogra …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. ….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner:	**Mr. Skand Sharma, Advocate vice Mr. Bhupinder Thakur, Advocate**
For the respondents:	**Mr. Dalip K. Sharma, Additional Advocate General.**

***Jyotsna Rewal Dua* , J**

Notice. Mr. Dalip K. Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

> *" (i) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to count the service of the petitioner from his initial appointment on contract basis till his regularization for the purpose of seniority, increments, pensionery benefits and other consequential benefits in terms of the judgment passed by this Hon'ble in CWP No. 2004/2017 titled as Taj Mohammad v/s State of H.P, CWPOA No 1745/2020 titled as Chaman Lal & Others v/s State of H.P and recently in CWPOA No 3282/2019 titled as Dr. Ranjeet Singh & others v/s State of HP and others in the interest of justice.*

---

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

(ii) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to release the entire consequential benefits along with interest @9% per annum from the date of their appointment to the date of realization."

3. According to the petitioner, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the petitioner is that her representation dated 11.04.2024 (Annexure P-4) has still not been decided by the respondents/competent authority.

4. Once the legal principle involved in the adjudication of present petition has already been decided, it is expected from the welfare State to consider and decide the representation of the aggrieved employee within a reasonable time and not to sit over the same indefinitely compelling the employee to come to the Court for redresssal of his grievances. This is also the purport and object of the Litigation Policy of the State. Not taking decision on the representation for months together would not only give rise to unnecessary multiplication of the litigation but would also bring in otherwise avoidable increase to the Court docket on unproductive government induced litigation.

5. In view of above, the instant petition is disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also

communicated to the petitioner. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

31st December, 2024(rohit)