

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

**CWP No. 11300/2024 a/w connected matters.
Decided on: 29.10.2024**

1. CWP No. 11300/2024

Anukriti Gaur ...Petitioner
Versus
State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

2. CWP No. 11302/2024

Nitin Gautam ...Petitioner
Versus
State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

3. CWP No. 11307/2024

Prerna ...Petitioner
Versus
State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

4. CWP No. 11308/2024

Bhagat Ram ...Petitioner
Versus
State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

5. CWP No. 11331/2024

Pradeep Kumar ...Petitioner
Versus
State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

6. CWP No. 11398/2024

Meenakshi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

7. **CWP No. 11399/2024**

Narvada Devi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

8. **CWP No. 11400/2024**

Dinesh Kaushal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

9. **CWP No. 11436/2024**

Monisha ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

10. **CWP No. 11509/2024**

Virender Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

11. **CWP No. 11299/2024**

Puran Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

12. **CWP No. 11301/2024**

Suman Thakur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

13. **CWP No. 11309/2024**

Sandeep Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioners: **Mr. Arush Matlotia, Advocate.**

For the respondents: **Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General
with Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional
Advocate General.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua , J

Notice. Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. The writ petitions have been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

“a. That a writ in the nature of mandamus may kindly be issued thereby directing the respondents to count the period of contract service of the petitioner for the purpose seniority, annual increments and all other consequential benefits.

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

b. That a writ in the nature of mandamus may kindly be issued thereby directing the respondents to decide the pending respective representations of the petitioner in time bound manner."

3. According to the petitioners, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the petitioners is that their respective representations have still not been decided by the respondents/competent authority.

4. Once the legal principle involved in the adjudication of present petition has already been decided, it is expected from the welfare State to consider and decide the representation of the aggrieved employee within a reasonable time and not to sit over the same in-definitely compelling the employee to come to the Court for redressal of his grievances. This is also the purport and object of the Litigation Policy of the State. Not taking decision on the representation for months together would not only give rise to unnecessary multiplication of the litigation but would also bring in otherwise avoidable increase to the Court docket on unproductive government induced litigation.

5. In view of above, the instant petition is disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the respective representations of the petitioners, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also

communicated to the petitioners. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge**

29th October, 2024_(rohit)