IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.15444 of 2024
Date of decision: 18.12.2024

Mohd. Sazrin. ...Petitioner.

Versus

Himachal Pradesh University. ...Respondent.

Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner	:	Mr. Sohail Khan, Advocate.
For the respondent	:	Mr. Devender K. Sharma, Advocate.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Devender K. Sharma, Advocate, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondent.

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

> *"i. That Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondent university to count the service of petitioner rendered in contract basis for the purpose of seniority, annual increment and alongwith all other consequential benefits from the date of initial appointment on contract basis in the interest of justice.*
>
> *ii. That the respondents herein may kindly be directed to release the entire consequential monetary benefits accrued in favour of petitioner since, from the day of initial appointment of the petitioner on contractual basis along with interest @12% per annum."*

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

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 19.11.2024 (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 redressal of their 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 eight

weeks from today. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioner.

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

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

17th December, 2024
(Pardeep)