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

**CWP No. 16588/2024 alongwith connected matters
Decided on: 31.12.2024**

1 CWP No. 16588/2024

Basant Mittal & Ors. …Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. ….Respondents.

2 CWP No. 16590/2024

Piar Chand & Ors. …Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. ….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner(s):	**Mr. Naresh Kaul and Ms. Sheetal Kaul, Advocates.**
For the respondent(s):	**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. These writ petitions have been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

> *"a) That the respondents may be directed to give regular appointment to the petitioners as members of service in the cadre*

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

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 03/11/2026 15:39:40 :::CIS

of 'Drug Inspectors' from the date of initial appointment i.e. 20.06.2012 and 26.12.2014, respectively (Annexure P-1) (contract basis) and count the service of petitioners rendered on 'contract basis' for the purpose of seniority, pension, annual increment, earned leave, carrier progression scheme alongwith all other consequential benefits, from the date of initial appointment alongwith interest @ 9% per annum w.e.f., the date when the same fell due till its actual realization, in the interest of law and justice.

b) That during the pendency of the present writ petition the respondents may kindly be directed to consider and decide the representation dated 20.10.2024(Annexure P.4) in a time bound manner, in terms of judgment passed in CWP No. 2004/2017 titled as Taj Mohd. Vs State of H.P. & Ors., decided 03.08.2023 (Annexure P-3), in the interest of law and justice."

3. According to the petitioners, the legal issue involved in the cases has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the petitioners is that their representations, annexed with the respective petitions, 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 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

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 03/11/2026 15:39:40 :::CIS

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 petitions are disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid 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

31st December, 2024(rohit)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 03/11/2026 15:39:40 :::CIS