**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA**

**CWP No. 13556/2024 alongwith connected matters
Decided on: 16.12.2024**

---

1 CWP No. 13556/2024

Kanta Sharma …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

2 CWP No. 13557/2024

Dhanbir Singh …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

3 CWP No. 13558/2024

Sund Ram …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

4. CWP No. 13559/2024

Sandhya Chauhan …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

5. CWP No. 13561/2024

Dhanbir Singh …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

6. CWP No. 13562/2024

Renu Sharma …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

7. CWP No. 13564/2024

Ramesh Chand Negi …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

8. CWP No. 13566/2024

Bhagat Singh Tomar …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner(s): **Mr. Tarun K. Sharma, Advocates .**

For the respondent(s): **Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional Advocate General.**

***Jyotsna Rewal Dua* , J**

Notice. Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. These writ petitions have been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

> *" (i) That the writ in the nature of mandamus may kindly be issued and the respondents may kindly be directed to extend the benefit of counting of contract service followed by regular service for annual increments, pensionary benefits under CCS Rules*

---

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

(Pension) rules 1972 and other consequential benefits to the petitioners.

(ii) That the respondents may kindly be directed to give all the consequential benefit to the petitioners during the pendency of the present writ petition."

3. According to the petitioners, the legal issue involved in the cases has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the petitioners is that their representations, annexed with the respective writ petitions, have 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 petitions are disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representations of the petitioners, in accordance with

law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioners. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

16th December, 2024(rohit)