IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP Nos.14312 and connected matters
Decided on: 30th December, 2024

---

1. CWP No. 14312 of 2024

Kanika Chauhan and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

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

---

2. CWP No. 14331 of 2024

Gian Chand . .....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

3. CWP No. 14333 of 2024

Rakesh Kumar .....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

4. CWP No. 14334 of 2024

Jagmohan Singh. .....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

5. CWP No. 14410 of 2024

Dhruv Kumar. .....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

6. CWP No. 14411 of 2024

Rajesh Kumar and others .....Petitioners

Versus

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

---

7. CWP No. 14412 of 2024

Nain Prabha and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

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

---

8. CWP No. 14413 of 2024

Ashok Kumar .....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

9. CWP No. 14414 of 2024

Kamal Singh Jamwal and Ors. .....Petitioners

Versus

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

---

10. CWP No. 14419 of 2024

Rajeesh Kumar .....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

11. CWP No. 14420 of 2024

Sheela Devi .....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

12. CWP No. 14421 of 2024

Savita Rani .....Petitioner

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. Dalip K.Sharma, Additional Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Dalip K. Sharma, learned Additional

---

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

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. 14312 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 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 30, 2024
R.Atal