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

CWP No. 14285 of 2024

Date of decision : 2.12.2024.

---

Ajit Kumar ..Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & others …Respondents.

---

*Coram:*

***The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satyen Vaidya, Judge.***

*Whether approved for reporting?*[1]

For the petitioners : Mr. Mandeep Chandel, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Pushpender Jaswal, Addl. A.G.

---

**Satyen Vaidya, Judge (Oral):**

Notice. Learned Additional Advocate General accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

2. The instant petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive relief:-

> *"i) That a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or directions may kindly be issued directing the respondents to add annual increments notionally till date which have been paid to the regularly TGT/Lecturers (School New) on the principle of equal pay for equal work from the date of his initial appointment on contract basis with all*

---

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

*consequential benefits (ACP, earned leaves proper fixation as per pay commission 2022).”*

*ii) That this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue the writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ order or direction to the respondent to grant earned leaves, commuted leaves from initial date of recruitment.”*

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petition can be disposed by issuance of directions to respondent No.2 to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of the judgment passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP No. 2004 of 2017, titled as, Taj Mohammad vs. State of H.P. & others, decided on 3.8.2023 and affirmed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgment. The representation of the petitioner to respondent No.2 dated 20.10. 2024 is already pending but no decision has been taken thereon. In this backdrop, he seeks indulgence of this Court for directions to respondent No.2 to decide the representation of the petitioner in a time bound manner.

5. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner Annexure P-5 dated

20.10.2024, strictly in terms of the judgment of Taj Mohammad's case within a period of eight weeks from today. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Satyen Vaidya)**
**Judge**

2nd December, 2024
(kck)