

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

CWP No. 6882/2025 a/w connected matters

Decided on: 30.04.2025

1. CWP No. 6882/2025

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

2. CWP No. 6884/2025

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

3. CWP No. 6886/2025

Ravi Dutt Bhardwaj	Versus	...Petitioner
State of H.P. & Ors.	Respondents.

4. CWP No. 6888/2025

Banti Sharma	Versus	...Petitioner
State of H.P. & Ors.	Respondents.

5. CWP No. 6890/2025

Shashi Kant	Versus	...Petitioner
State of H.P. & Ors.	Respondents.

6. CWP No. 6892/2025

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

7. CWP No. 6894/2025

Ashok Kumar	Versus	...Petitioner
-------------	---------------	---------------

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

8. CWP No. 6896/2025

Surinder Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

9. CWP No. 6924/2025

Gurcharan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

.....
Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner:

Mr. Dixit Sahotra, Advocate.

For the respondents:

**Mr. Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional
Advocate General, for respondents
No.1 & 2 in all the petitions.**

**Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate, for
respondents No.3 & 4 in all the
petitions.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua , J

Notice. Mr. Y.P.S Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General and Mr. Deepak Sharma, learned counsel, accept notice on behalf of respondents No.1 & 2 and 3 & 4, respectively.

2. These writ petitions have been filed for the grant of almost common substantive reliefs. Relief clause herein is extracted from CWP No. 6882/2025:-

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

“Issue a Writ of Mandamus, appropriate writ, order or direction in nature thereof, directing the respondents to regularize the petitioner's service w.e.f. 21.10.2019, i.e., the date on which the petitioner has completed his three years of service on the said post with all consequential benefits and pay arrears to the petitioner along with interest @18%.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submitted that respective representations of the petitioner(s) preferred by them, have not been considered and decided by respondent No.3/competent authority till date. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner(s) would be content, in case, they are permitted to submit a fresh comprehensive representation(s) to the aforesaid respondent/competent authority seeking the relief prayed for by them in the writ petitions, whereafter, respondent No.3/competent authority, be directed to decide the representations to be made by them, in a time bound manner. Learned Additional Advocate General has no objection to this prayer.

3. In view of above submissions, the present petitions are disposed of by permitting the petitioner(s) to make fresh comprehensive representations to respondent No.3/competent authority, within a period of two weeks from today, who shall in turn, consider and decide the same, in accordance with law and applicable Transfer Policy, within a further period of six weeks by passing a reasoned order, which shall also be communicated to the

petitioner(s). Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

30th April, 2025_(rohit)