SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS UKHC010188032026 2026:UHC:10009
			UKHC010188032026 **WPSS/2721/2026** Sri Prem Ballabh Sati --Petitioner **Versus** State of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Rakesh Thapliyal, J.** Mr. Pankaj Tangwan, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. S.S. Chaudhary, learned Standing Counsel for the State/1 to 4. 3. By the instant petition, the petitioner is praying for the following reliefs:- *"(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 10.07.2025 passed by Respondent No. 1 (Annexure- 5 Page no. 25).* *ii. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents to re-determine the petitioner's seniority in the cadre of Class-III / Clerk by taking into account his continuous service commencing from his initial date of appointment, i.e., 21.01.1994.* *iii. Issue a writ, order or direction commanding the respondents to grant all consequential service benefits, including notional seniority, pay fixation, and promotional eligibility from the initial date of entry into service.* *iv. Pass any other suitable writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."* 4. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was offered appointment under the Dying In Harness Rules in a Class IV post in the year 1994. Subsequently, he made a representation that his appointment to the Class IV post is not according to his qualification since he is entitled to get appointment on a Class III post and

			subsequently on his representation the instructions were issued and by order dated 22.10.1998, he was appointed to the post of Clerk. 5. Now, the instant petition has been moved that the services as rendered in Class IV post since 1994 up to the date when he was appointed in Class III post be computed for the purposes of seniority. This claim was rejected by the order impugned on the basis that the appointment offered in the year 1998 in a Class III post was not given effect to from retrospective date, therefore, the period which he has rendered in a Class IV post cannot be computed for the purposes of seniority. 6. Admittedly, the petitioner was offered initially appointment in Class IV post in 1994, and thereafter in the year 1998, he was offered appointment on Class III post, therefore, in such an eventuality when he was given appointment in a Class III post in 1998, he cannot claim seniority from retrospective date. Hence, I do not find any merit in this petition, and the same is dismissed. **(Rakesh Thapliyal, J.)** 26.10.2026 Nitesh/