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

CWP No. 13738/2024 alongwith connected matters
Decided on: 19.12.2024

1 CWP No. 13738/2024

Ranjeet Singh …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

2 CWP No. 13739/2024

Yudhi Chand …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

3 CWP No. 13740/2024

Anu Ram …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

4 CWP No. 13741/2024

Sukh Dev …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. Manohar Lal Sharma, Advocate.**

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

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

***Jyotsna Rewal Dua* , J**

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

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

> *"That the directions may kindly be issued to the respondents to count the contractual service of the petitioner with effect from the date of his initial appointment on contractual basis for all intents and purposes, i.e., seniority, pay scale as revised time to time, annual increments, proficiency step- up and promotion against the post of Senior Assistant, as per the judgment dated 03.08.2023 passed by this Hon'ble Court in CWP 2004/2017 titled as Taj Mohammad vs. State of H.P. Annexure P-5.*
> *(ii) That the respondent department may kindly be directed to pay all consequential benefits to the petitioner from the due dates with interest @ 12% per annum till the date of realization."*

3. According to the petitioners, the legal issue involved in the case 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)