IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP No.15778 of 2024

Decided on: 27th December, 2024

Sunil Kumar ....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ...Respondents

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Chauhan, Advocate.
For the respondents:	Mr.Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Dalip Sharma and Mr. Amandeep Sharma, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Balwinder Singh and Mr. Manish Thakur, Deputy Advocates General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Manish Thakur, learned Deputy Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

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

---

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

> " *(i) Issue writ of mandamus directing the Respondent to count the service rendered by petitioner on contract basis as Junior Basic Teacher from 20-03-2014 to 18-05-2017 for seniority, annual increment, pensionary and other consequential benefit as per the law laid down by this Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 2004 of 2017 alongwith connected vide judgment 03-08-2023 titled as Shri Taj Mohammad & others in the interest of justice and fair play."*

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 04.11.2024 (Annexure P-2) 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 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 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, also to stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

December 27, 2024
R.Atal