IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16130 of 2024
Date of decision: 26.12.2024

Jaiwanti. ...Petitioner.

Versus

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

Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner	:	Ms. Anuja Mehta, Advocate, vice Mr. Gurmeet Bhardwaj, Advocate.
For the respondent	:	Mr. Amandeep Sharma, Additional Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Amandeep Sharma, Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

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

> *"i. That the respondents may kindly be directed to fix the pay of petitioner in the pay band of Rupees 10300-34800+4400 (GP) with additional 3% promotional increment w.e.f. 01.10.2012 as done with the incumbents promoted to the post of Head Teacher after 01.10.2012, with all consequential benefits and interest 9% per annum, in view of the judgment dated 07.07.2023, passed by this Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 2500 of 2021 and other connected matter, titled as "Ranjit Singh and others versus The State of Himachal*

Pradesh and others", as the respondent department has already implemented the judgment.

ii). That the Respondents may very kindly be directed to consider and decide the representations dated 20.08.2024 and 17.08.2024 filed by the petitioner."

3. According to the petitioner, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the petitioner is that her representation dated 27.11.2024 (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 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

26th December, 2024
(Pardeep)