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

**CWP No. 13766/2024 alongwith connected matters**
**Decided on: 19.12.2024**

---

**1 CWP No. 13766/2024**

Kuldeep Chand & Ors. …Petitioners

**Versus**

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

**2 CWP No. 13779/2024**

Kamal Kumar …Petitioner

**Versus**

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

**3 CWP No. 13770/2024**

Chaman Lal & Anr. …Petitioners

**Versus**

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

……

***Coram***
***Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.***

**Whether approved for reporting?**[1]

**For the petitioner(s):** **Mr. Raj Thakur, Advocate.**

**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.

---

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

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

> *"i. That the respondents may very kindly be directed to grant the pay scale of Rs. 5480-8925 as is prescribed to the post of Shastri teacher instead of pay scale of Rs. 5000-8100 as was granted to him on his initial appointment on 01.04.1999/13.11.2000 with all consequential benefits and the arrears accrued thereunder may very kindly be ordered to be released with interest @ 9% p.a., in the interest of justice.*
> *ii. That the respondents may kindly be directed to produce the entire record pertaining to the case, for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court."*

**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 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 petition is 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**

**19th December, 2024**(rohit)