IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP Nos.14012 and connected matters
Decided on: 23rd December, 2024

---

1. CWP No. 14012 of 2024

Jagjit Kaur and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

2. CWP No. 14016 of 2024

Gurjeet Kaur and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

3. CWP No. 14017 of 2024

Sarita Devi and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

4. CWP No. 14019 of 2024

Mangat Ram Mansaik .....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

5. CWP No. 14020 of 2024

Niukt Bhardwaj and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

6. CWP No. 14021 of 2024

Sapna and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

7. CWP No. 14091 of 2024

Mamta Dogra. .....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

8. CWP No. 14092 of 2024

Anjla Devi and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

9. CWP No. 14093 of 2024

Amarjeet Kaur .....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

---

10. CWP No. 14094 of 2024

Manoj Kumar and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. .....Respondents

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner(s): Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. L.N.Sharma, Additional Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. L.N.Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents in all the petitions.

2. These writ petitions have been filed for grant of following identical substantive relief (Prayer has been extracted from CWP No. 14012 of 2024): -

> "*1. That a writ of mandamus may kindly be issued directing the respondents to grant to the petitioners the benefit of contract service for all the purposes including seniority, annual increments, promotion along with all the*

---

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

> *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 petitioners 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 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 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 the above, this writ petition is disposed of by directing the 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, also to stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

December 23, 2024
R.Atal