IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP Nos. 13848 to 13853, 1385, 13856, 13857 & 13870 of 2024
Date of decision: 20.12.2024

---

1. CWP No.13848 of 2024

Renuka Thakur ...Petitioner.

Versus

State of HP & Anr. ...Respondents.

---

2. CWP No.13849 of 2024

Nirmala Devi ...Petitioner.

Versus

State of HP & Ors. ...Respondents.

---

3. CWP No.13850 of 2024

Vijay Pal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of HP & Anr. ...Respondents.

---

4. CWP No.13851 of 2024

Bandana Devi & Anr. ...Petitioners.

Versus

State of HP & Ors. ...Respondents.

---

5. CWP No.13852 of 2024

Ashutosh Sharma ...Petitioner.

Versus

State of HP & Ors. ...Respondents.

Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes

6. CWP No.13853 of 2024

Mahender Paul Singh ...Petitioner.

Versus

State of HP & Anr. ...Respondents.

---

7. CWP No.13855 of 2024

Shashi Lata and Ors. ...Petitioners.

Versus

State of HP & Anr. ...Respondents.

---

8. CWP No.13856 of 2024

Ravinder and Others ...Petitioners.

Versus

State of HP & Anr. ...Respondents.

---

9. CWP No.13857 of 2024

Subhash Kumar and Anr. ...Petitioners.

Versus

State of HP & Anr. ...Respondents.

---

10. CWP No.13870 of 2024

Ajay Katoch ...Petitioner.

Versus

State of HP & Ors. ...Respondents.

Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? No

For the petitioners	:	Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.
For the respondent(s)	:	Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Dalip K. Sharma, Additional Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Dalip K. Sharma, Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. The writ petitions have been filed for the grant of following substantive relief(s) extracted from one of the writ petitions:-

> *"1. That a writ of mandamus may kindly be issued directing the respondents to grant to the petitioner the benefit of contract service for all the purposes including seniority, annual increments along with all the consequential benefits as per the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Court in "Taj Mohammad v. State of Himachal Pradesh and others," CWP No. 2004 of 2017. Further direct the respondents to release to the petitioner all the consequential benefits along with arrears at the rate of 9% per annum."*

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 respective representations 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 redressal 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, these writ petitions are disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the respective 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.

The writ petitions stand disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

20th December, 2024
(Pardeep)