IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 14170/2024
Decided on: 26.12.2024

Ravi Dutt …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. ….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner:	**Mr. Devender K. Sharma, Advocate.**
For the respondents:	**Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General** **Mr. Amandeep Sharma, Additional Advocate General.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua **, J**

Notice. Mr. Amandeep Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive relief:-

> *" a) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondent department to count the service of petitioner rendered in contract basis for the purpose of seniority, pension, annual increment and career scheme along with progression all other consequential benefits from the date of initial appointment on contract basis in the interest of justice.*

---

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

> *b) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondent department to count the service of petitioner rendered in contract basis for the purpose of earned leave from the date of initial appointment on contract basis in the interest of justice."*

3. According to the petitioner, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the petitioner is that his representation dated 28.09.2024 (Annexure P-4) has 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 representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also

communicated to the petitioner. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

26th December, 2024(rohit)