IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP Nos.15448 & 15449 of 2024
Date of decision: 18.12.2024

---

1. CWP No.15448 of 2024

Sandhya. ...Petitioner.

Versus

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

---

2. CWP No.15449 of 2024

Ajay Verma. ...Petitioner.

Versus

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

Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioners	:	Mr. Rajendera Gulati & Mr. SS. Saini, Advocates.
For the respondent(s)	:	Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional Advocate General, for the respondents No.1 to 3-State.
	:	Mr. Susheel Gautam, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Susheel Gautam, appear and waive service of notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and respondent No.4.

Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes

2. The writ petitions have been filed for the grant of following substantive relief(s) extracted from one of the writ petitions:-

> *"i). That direction may be kindly be issued, thereby directing the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner as Social Extension Officer or Grade-Il Officer in this department ,since petitioners has become entitled for the same in respondents department.*
>
> *(ii) along with, all consequential benefits of pay scale, increments, seniority and arrears along with interest till date since petitioner is continuously serving since his/her engagement in the year 2007 till the date and similarly situated persons have been regularized by the respondents, in the year interest of justice."*

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 respective representations 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 above, these writ petitions are disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the respective 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.

The writ petitions stand disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

18th December, 2024
(Pardeep)