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

CWP No. 15786/2024
Decided on: 31.12.2024

Kiran Kumari …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner: **None.**

For the respondents: **Mr. Dalip K. Sharma, Additional Advocate General.**

***Jyotsna Rewal Dua* , J**

Notice. Mr. Dalip K. Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

> *" Issue writ of mandamus directing the respondent to count the service rendered by petitioner on contract basis as Junior Basic Teacher from 23.07.2019 to 16.01.2022 for seniority, annual increment, pensionary and other consequential benefit as per the law laid down by this Hon'ble Court in CWP No.2004 of 2017 alongwith connected vide judgment 03.08.2023 titled as Shri Taj Mohammad & Others in the interest of justice and fair play."*

3. According to the petitioner, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the

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

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 03/11/2026 18:07:06 :::CIS

petitioner is that her representation dated 08.11.2024 (Annexure P-2) has 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 indefinitely compelling the employee to come to the Court for redresssal 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 aforesaid representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioner. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

31st December, 2024(rohit)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 03/11/2026 18:07:06 :::CIS