IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADSH
AT SHIMLA

Ex. Petition No. 2579 of 2026
Decided on: 28.10.2026

Suresh Kumar ....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ....Respondents

Coram :

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge

[1] *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner : Ms. Nandita, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Varun Chandel, Additional Advocate General.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge

Petitioner has come up before this Court, seeking execution/implementation of the order/judgment dated 10.01.2024 [Annexure E-1], passed in CWP No. 371 of 2024, titled as Rakhi Sharma and Ors. versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others whereby, a Coordinate Bench of this Court, had passed the following orders:-

> "14. In these circumstances, and on the request of learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions of the petitioners, this Court permits the petitioners to make

---

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

representation, either jointly or separately, to the Respondents/Competent Authority, in continuation of earlier representations [Annexure P-10 (colly)] within three weeks; with further directions to the aforesaid Respondent/Competent Authority to verify the facts and, in case, the petitioners are similarly placed then, to consider/examine the case of the petitioners for extending similar benefit of regular appointment from the date the petitioners were appointed on contractual basis as Trained Graduate Teachers, in the light of above referred judgments within six weeks thereafter.

15. Upon consideration, in case, the respondents decide to extend the benefit of deemed regular appointment to the petitioner(s), as Trained Graduate Teachers, from the date of initial appointment on contractual basis, then, the respondents shall grant the consequential benefits notionally. However, it is clarified that the respondents shall give the eligible monetary benefits, admissible to the petitioner, in accordance with law'

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that as a sequel to the order/judgment dated 10.1.2024, [Annexure E1], though Director of Elementary Education, Himachal

Pradesh, has issued an order on 16.6.2024 [Annexure E-2], giving the benefit of deemed regular appointment from the date of initial contractual appointment to the petitioner, but admissible monetary benefits have not been released to the petitioner.

3. Learned Counsel further submitted that out of total arrears of Rs. 4,41,881/- the Respondents have released one instalment of arrears of Rs. 88,153/- as in [Annexure E-3] whereas the monetary benefits-consequential benefits in terms of the judgment have not been released to the petitioner as yet.

4. Heard.

5. Notice. Varun Chandel, Additional Advocate General, waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

6. At this stage, Learned Counsel submits that petitioner shall be satisfied, in case, the Respondent-Competent Authority decides the case and release the consequential benefits to the petitioner in a time bound manner [*Statement taken on record*].

7. Considering the matter in above perspective, this Court directs the Respondent/Competent Authority to decide the matter in terms of the order/judgment within six weeks positively.

8. Needless to say, that in case, the decision is not taken in terms of the order, petitioner liberty is reserved to seek appropriate remedy.

9. In aforesaid terms, instant petition and all the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

October 28, 2026
(Anita)