

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA**

**CWP No.8428 of 2014 a/w CWPs
No. 8429, 8430, 8431, 8432, 8442,
8443, 8444, 8452, 8453, 8454 and
8459 of 2014**

Date of decision: 28.11.2014

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | CWP No.8428 of 2014 | |
| | Nikka Ram |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 2. | CWP No.8429 of 2014 | |
| | Gauri Shankar Garg |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 3. | CWP No.8430 of 2014 | |
| | Anant Ram |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 4. | CWP No.8431 of 2014 | |
| | Lachhmi Ram |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 5. | CWP No.8432 of 2014 | |
| | Devi Lal |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 6. | CWP No.8442 of 2014 | |
| | Jagdish Chander |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 7. | CWP No.8443 of 2014 | |
| | Bidu Ram |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-------------------|
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 8. | CWP No.8444 of 2014 | |
| | Bhim Singh |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 9. | CWP No.8452 of 2014 | |
| | Narinder Kumar |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 10. | CWP No.8453 of 2014 | |
| | Surinder Singh |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 11. | CWP No.8454 of 2014 | |
| | Narinder Singh |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |
| 12. | CWP No.8459 of 2014 | |
| | Mahesh Chand |Petitioner |
| | Versus | |
| | Union of India & others | Respondents |

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Mansoor Ahmad Mir, Chief Justice
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tarlok Singh Chauhan, Judge

Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner(s): Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Ashok Sharma, Assistant Solicitor
General of India.

Mansoor Ahmad Mir, Chief Justice (oral)

It is contended by learned counsel for the
petitioner(s) that the petitioner(s) is entitled to the benefit of

Assured Career Progression Scheme (for short 'the Scheme'), but the respondents have not considered the case of the petitioner(s) for grant of the said benefit.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Ashok Sharma, learned Assistant Solicitor General of India, waives notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. In the given circumstances, we deem it proper to dispose of this writ petition alongwith pending applications by providing that the petitioner(s) is at liberty to file a representation(s) before the competent authority within two weeks from today and thereafter the competent authority to examine the same and make a decision thereon in the light of Annexure P-2 to Annexure P-5, within six weeks, as per the Rules occupying the field read with the Scheme. Ordered accordingly.

4. It goes without saying that in case the decision goes against the petitioner(s), he/she is at liberty to seek appropriate remedy, in accordance with law. Registry is directed to place a copy of this judgment in each of the file.

Copy **dasti**.

(**Mansoor Ahmad Mir**)
Chief Justice

November 28, 2014
(vt/rkv)

(**Tarlok Singh Chauhan**)
Judge