

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.4554 of 2025
Date of Decision: 28.03.2025

Ashwani Kumar Bali	VersusPetitioner
State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.	Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Raj Thakur, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. Vishal Panwar & Mr. B.C. Verma, Additional Advocate Generals, with Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents-State.

Sandeep Sharma, J. (Oral)

By way of instant petition, petitioner has prayed for the following main relief:

“(i) That the respondents may very kindly be directed to grant the pay scale of Rs. 1640-2925 as is prescribed to the post of Shastri teacher instead of pay scale of Rs. 1500-2700 as was granted to him on his initial appointment on 01.04.1994, with all consequential benefits and the arrears accrued thereunder may very kindly be ordered to be released with interest @ 9% p.a., in the interest of justice.”

2. Before reply, if any, from the respondents could be received, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that petitioner would be content and satisfied in case his case is considered and decided in the light of judgment passed by this Court

in CWP No. 3341 of 2019 titled **Madan Lal Sharma Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr.**

3. While putting in appearance on behalf of respondents, Mr. Ravi Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General, states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner and representation, if any, filed by the petitioner shall be considered and decided expeditiously.

3. Consequently, in view of the aforesaid fair stand adopted by learned Deputy Advocate General, coupled with the fact that petitioner has already filed representation for redressal of his grievance (**Annexure P-1**), this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment passed by this Court in **Madan Lal Sharma** (*supra*), expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass speaking order thereafter. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

March 28, 2025
(sunil)

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge