IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16143 of 2025
Date of Decision: 14.10.2025

Atul Katnoria and Ors. **.....Petitioners**

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. **.....Respondents**

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioners: Mr. Kush Sharma, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Before reply, if any could be called for from the respondents, learned counsel for the petitioner invited attention of this Court to judgment dated 21.3.2024, passed by the coordinate Bench of this Court in bunch of petitions, lead case whereof is CWP No. 8148 of 2022, titled as *Yashwant Kumar v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.*, to state that issue otherwise sought to be decided in the instant proceedings, already stands adjudicated in the aforesaid judgment and as such, petitioners would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide representation of the petitioners in light of aforesaid judgment. He further submitted that in one of the connected cases i.e. COPC No. 722 of 2024 in CWP No. 2056 of 2023, titled as Ghanshyam Dass and Ors. v. Mr. Devesh Kumar and Ors., decided on 18.6.2025, afore judgment has not only

been implemented, but benefit arising out of the same has already been released to the petitioners in terms of orders passed by this Court in Ghanshyam Dass (supra)

2. Having carefully perused aforesaid judgment vis-à-vis relief sought in the instant petition, Mr. B.C. Verma, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting in appearance on behalf of the respondents, states that he is not opposed to the aforesaid innocuous prayer made by the petitioners.

3. Having carefully perused averments contained in the petition, which is duly supported by an affidavit, this court finds that issue sought to be decided in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated in the aforesaid judgment. Limited grievance of the petitioners in the case at hand is that as Himachal Pradesh Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2022 were given effect w.e.f. 1.1.2016, therefore, petitioners are also entitled to be paid the difference of the minimum of pay band plus grade pay as was actually paid to them vis-à-vis the minimum of pay band plus grade pay after revision. Coordinate Bench of this Court having taken note of aforesaid fact has already directed in bunch of petitions, as has been noticed herein above, to fix the pay of the petitioners for the period they served on contract basis in the revised pay band plus grade pay alongwith such hike, to which they are entitled to in terms of revised notification, which has been not held invalid till date.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide representation of the petitioners (**Annexure P-3**) in light of ***Yashwant Kumar*** *(supra)*, which has not been interfered till date, expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Ordered accordingly. In case, petitioners are found to be similarly situate to the petitioner in the aforesaid judgment, they would be extended similar benefits. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioners and pass appropriate orders thereafter. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

October 14, 2025 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
Manjit **Judge**