

Sanjeev Singh and another Vs. State of H.P. and another
CWP No.1627 of 2024

06.07.2026 Present: Mr. Vikas Rajput, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, Additional Advocate General, for the respondents-State.

Heard for some time. Though, it is a matter on record that as from the initial date of engagement of the petitioners by the College in which they were appointed for the first time, they have not completed ten years of service as on the date when their services were taken over by the Government upon the taking over of the College itself by the Government, yet the petitioners have highlighted the case of one Shri Sumesh Kumar, who under similar circumstances was given relaxation of one year by the State, whereas in terms of the impugned order the Court stands informed that the case of the petitioner for relaxation of four months and few days was rejected by the Cabinet.

This Court fails to understand that if earlier similarly situated person was given the benefit of relaxation, then why the same has been denied to the petitioners.

Learned Additional Advocate General to have specific instructions in this regard, as to how the State can discriminate between similarly situated persons.

As prayed for, list on **24.07.2026**.

Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

July 06, 2026
(Rishi)