IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16872 of 2025

Decided on: 30th October, 2025

Parveen Kumar **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Onkar Jairath, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No.1 to 3.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice confined to respondents No.1 to 3, which is waived by Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General.

In view of nature of order being passed hereinafter, neither notice of this petition is required to be issued to respondent No.4 nor reply is required to be called for from the appearing respondents.

2. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matter is heard at this stage.

---

[1]**Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.**

3. This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive relief:-

> *"A. That a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction may kindly be issued, directing the Respondents to step up the basic pay of the Petitioner from Rs.51100/- to Rs.54200/- at par with his junior, Respondent No.4 namely Shri Gyar Singh Negi, w.e.f. 01.11.2017, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Union of India and Others v. Madhav Murti, (2022) 6 SCC 183, as well as the judgment passed by this Hon'ble Court in CWP No.2247 of 2022, Yatinder Nath Sharma v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Others, and further to grant all consequential benefits including refixation of pay in subsequent revisions, release of arrears of pay and allowances along with interest thereon, and protection of seniority, within such time as this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper."*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has preferred a representation to respondent No.2 on 16.08.2025 (Annexure P-5) for stepping up of his pay at par with his junior-respondent No.4. Relief has been claimed on the strength of the decisions mentioned above, however, till date the said representation has not been decided. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner would be satisfied in case respondent No.2/ competent authority is directed to decide the aforesaid representation within a fixed time schedule. Learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to this prayer.

5. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, this writ

petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2/ competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner dated 16.08.2025 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law, keeping in view the above-decisions as also the decisions mentioned by the petitioner in her representation, within a period of six weeks from today. The decision so arrived at shall also be 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

October 30, 2025
R.Atal