



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

LPA No.161 of 2026
Reserved on : 09.04.2026
Decided on : 20.04.2026
Uploaded on : 20.04.2026

Beasa Thakur

...appellant.

Versus

State of HP and Others.

...Respondents.

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Gurmeet Singh Sandhawalia, Chief Justice.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bipin Chander Negi, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the appellant : Mr. Sparsh Bhushan, Advocate.

For the respondent(s) : Mr. Sidharth Jalta, Deputy Advocate General.

Bipin Chander Negi, Judge

The present appeal has been preferred against the impugned judgment dated 05.01.2026, passed by the learned Single Judge in **CWP No.18858 of 2025, titled *Beasa Thakur Vs. State of HP and Ors.***, whereby the writ petition preferred by the present appellant seeking sessional re-employment for the ongoing Academic Session 2025-26, in terms of Notification dated 27.08.2025 (Annexure P-1), on account of the appellant having attained the age of superannuation on 30.11.2025, has been denied.

2. Brief facts giving rise to the present appeal are that



the appellant was working on the post of Head Craft Mistress. In terms of the reply filed to the writ petition, specifically para 5 of the preliminary submissions, the post of Head Craft Mistress functions as a Group Instructor in Industrial Training Institutes, where post of Group Instructors was not originally created.

3. Other than the aforesaid, from a perusal of preliminary submission No.7 in the reply filed on behalf of respondents, it is apparent that for the post of Head Craft Mistress the feeder post is that of a Junior Tailoring Mistress (JTM). Post of Junior Tailoring Mistress presently is a dying cadre. A Junior Tailoring Mistress performs instructional duties in a sharp contrast to the post of Head Craft Mistress, which carries distinct supervisory responsibility.

4. Sessional re-employment for ongoing Academic Session 2025-26 in terms of Notification dated 27.08.2025 has been granted to all teachers/teaching faculty up-till the end of the ongoing academic session. However, vide letter dated 19.11.2025 (Annexure P-2) issued to all Principals/DDOs it was made clear that the post of Head Craft Mistress in Government Industrial Training Institutes (ITI) being



supervisory in nature, therefore, does not fall within the purview of the Notification dated 27.08.2025 (Annexure P-1).

5. In the aforesaid factual matrix, a challenge was laid to Annexure P-2 i.e. letter dated 19.11.2025 whereby the post of Head Craft Mistress in the Government Industrial Training Institutes were held to be supervisory in nature and therefore, not falling within the purview of Notification dated 27.08.2025.

6. The moot question which came up for consideration before the learned Single Judge was with respect to the nature of post of Head Craft Mistress. As has already been stated supra, a Head Craft Mistress functions as a Group Instructor in Industrial Training Institutes where post of Group Instructors was not originally created.

7. In the aforesaid backdrop, attention of the learned Single Judge was drawn to the relevant portion of the DGE&T Training Manual of the Regulatory Agency (Annexure R-2/1). The same has been reproduced in para 4(ii) of the impugned judgment. Besides the aforesaid, the learned Single Judge in this regard considered office order dated 19.06.2025. Based on the aforesaid, the learned Single Judge correctly came to the conclusion that the primary duty of Group Instructor Head



Craft Mistress is supervisory in nature.

8. The contention of the appellant that she had taken certain classes in terms of Annexure P-4 (Colly) and Annexure P-6, hence, in her case the post of Head Craft Mistress be taken within the ambit of Teacher/teaching faculty has correctly been rejected by the learned Single Judge by observing that grant of additional duties in the form of teaching discharged by the appellant whose post otherwise does not fall under the teaching faculty would not attract the benefit of Notification dated 27.08.2025 (Annexure P-1).

9. No incident was brought to the notice of the writ Court wherefrom it could be deduced that neither any Principal nor any supervisory cadre officer in any Government Industrial Training Institute had been granted sessional re-employment in pursuance to notification dated 27.08.2025. Further it has been correctly observed by the learned Single Judge that merely because Head Teacher/Principals serving in Government School and Colleges, who belong to the teaching faculty have been granted the benefit of sessional re-employment would not mean that respondents are liable to apply the Notification dated 27.08.2025 to non-teaching



cadres in Government Industrial Training Institutes.

10. Thus, for the aforesaid reasons, we are of the considered view that the present appeal is bereft of merit, therefore, the same is dismissed accordingly.

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

(G.S. Sandhawalia)
Chief Justice

(Bipin Chander Negi)
Judge

20th April, 2026
(VS/Gaurav Rawat)