IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP No.16100 of 2024 and connected matters.

Decided on: 26th December, 2024

---

1. CWP No.16100 of 2024

Manita Kumari ....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

2. CWP No.16102 of 2024

Parveen Rani ....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

3. CWP No.16104 of 2024

Anuradha & Ors ....Petitioners

Versus

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

---

4. CWP No.16105 of 2024

Malkan Devi ....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

5. CWP No.16106 of 2024

Raj Mal & Ors ....Petitioners

Versus

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

---

6. CWP No.16107 of 2024

Gulab Singh & Ors ....Petitioners

Versus

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

---

7. CWP No.16115 of 2024

Seema Devi ....Petitioner

Versus

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

---

8. CWP No.16159 of 2024

Sonia & Ors ....Petitioners

Versus

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

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner(s): Mr. Amit K. Dhumal, Advocate.

For the respondents: Ms. Menka Raj Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Ms. Menka Raj Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on

---

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

behalf of the respondents in all the petitions.

2. These writ petitions have been filed for grant of following identical reliefs (prayers have been extracted from CWP No. 16100 of 2024): -

> " *A) That the respondent authority be directed to count entire services rendered by the petitioner on contract basis from the year 2014 with the Respondent Department and being regularized in the year 2018.*
>
> *B) That the Respondent Authority be directed to give all benefits from the date of her initial appointment i.e., in the year 2014 followed by her regularization, for the purpose of increments, seniority and all other consequential service benefits, arising therefrom in terms of judgment passed in Taj Mohammad Case..*"

3. According to the petitioners, the legal issue involved in the case 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 26, 2024
R.Atal