IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

CWP No. 11642 of 2026.
Decided on : 1st October, 2026

Jitender Kumar **...Petitioner.**

Versus

Managing Director, H.P. State Cooperative Bank.

....**Respondents.**

Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Karan Sharma, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Suneel Mohan Goel, Senior Advocate with Mr. Raman Jamalta, Advocate.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Even though the respondents have not filed reply, however, with consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matter has accordingly been heard at this stage.

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

> *"a. To pass an appropriate Writ order in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents, to release the grant of financial up-gradation under ACPS (4-9-14) time scale/enhancement after having completed Second Time Scale of nine years of service at par with the counterparts under New Assured Career Progression Scheme completion of 4, 9 and 14 years of service in one cadre (as per the ACP-9, Scheme vide H.O Office Order No 286/2021-2022) and thereafter fixation of the salary under the new pay scale 2016.*

[1] Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

> *b. To pass an appropriate Writ order thereby, granting the benefit under New Assured Career Progression Scheme to the petitioner seeking parity "on equal status post" as has been done in cases of similarly situated persons of other department of Himachal Pradesh State Co-operative Bank.*
>
> *c. That writ in the nature of mandamus may very kindly be issued, directing the respondents to pay all the arrears accrued to the petitioner with interest @12% per annum thereon, from the date of becoming due i.e. 2020, till its realization."*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue raised by him has already been adjudicated upon in ***Sanjay Kumar vs. State of H.P. & Ors.***[2]***.*** Petitioner's grievance is that his representation, Annexure P-6, seeking applicability of ***Sanjay Kumar***[2] has not been considered and decided till date by the respondents/competent authority.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner would be content in case the respondents/competent authority(s) are directed to consider and decide the aforesaid representation in accordance with law within a fixed-time schedule. Learned counsel for the respondents 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 a direction to the respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner in accordance with law as well as taking into consideration the above judgment within a period of six

[2] CWPOA No. 5536 of 2020, decided on 01.11.2023

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

1st October, 2026.
(jai)