IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA

CWP No. 18443 of 2026.
Decided on : 26th October, 2026

Naveen Parmar & Anr. **...Petitioners.**

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. **....Respondents.**

Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioners: Ms. Shalini Thakur, Mr. Praveen Chandel and Mr. Sahil Singh Thakur, Advocates.

For the respondents: Mr. L. N. Sharma, Additional Advocate General for respondent No.1.
Ms. Neelam Kaplas, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Notice. Mr. L. N. Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General and Ms. Neelam Kaplas, learned counsel appear and waive service of notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2, respectively.

2. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matters are heard at this stage.

3. The petitioners are serving as Junior Office Assistant (Information Technology), IT, in respondent No. 2. Their representation for considering contractual service for the purpose of promotion was rejected by respondent No.2 on 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-3), primarily for the reason

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

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 10/11/2026 13:14:34 :::CIS

that there was no such provision in the contractual policy of the State Government, as also in the applicable Recruitment and Promotion Rules. The petitioners have preferred this writ petition seeking applicability of ***Taj Mohammad and others Versus The State of Himachal Pradesh and others***[2] for claiming the aforesaid relief. Their grievance is that their representation (Annexure P-5) preferred in this regard has not been considered and decided in view of Taj Mohammad.

It is an admitted position that the "Himachal Pradesh Recruitment and Conditions of Service of Government Employees Act, 2024" has been quashed and set aside in ***Devinder Kumar & Ors. Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr***[3]. It is also a matter of record that ***State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr. Vs. Devinder Kumar & Ors.***[4] instituted by the State of Himachal Pradesh against the aforementioned judgment, has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 29.07.2026. While dismissing the appeal, the Hon'ble Apex Court granted four months' time to the State Government to do the needful in terms of the judgment.

4. In view of above, the present petition is disposed of with direction to the respondents to consider the cases of the petitioners afresh notwithstanding the rejection order dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-3) for the grant of relief prayed for by them, in accordance with the time-

[2] CWP No.2004 of 2017 decided alongwith connected matter on 03.08.2023.
[3] CWP No. 3361 of 2025 decided alonwith connected matters on 25.04.2026
[4] Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 24885/2026 decided on 29.07.2026

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 10/11/2026 13:14:34 :::CIS

line indicated by the Hon'ble Apex Court. The petitioners are at liberty to seek appropriate remedy for the redressal of their surviving grievances, if any, at an appropriate stage, in case, necessity so arises, in future. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

26th October, 2026.
(jai)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 10/11/2026 13:14:34 :::CIS