



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.5074 of 2025

Date of Decision: 07.04.2025

Bimla Devi Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Others Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Desh Raj Thakur, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. Vishal Panwar and Mr. B.C.Verma, Additional Advocate Generals and Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant petition, petitioner has prayed for following main relief:-

“a. Appropriate writ or direction to the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner with effect from 01.10.2021 in terms of the policy decision dated 28.12.2021 (Annexure P-3).

b. Appropriate writ or direction to the respondents to fix the pay of the petitioner at higher pay stage at Rupees 40,100/- from the date of completion of 2 years regular service in terms of notification dated 06.09.2022 with the further direction to release the arrears of salary with all consequential benefits along with interest @ 9% per annum on delayed payment.”

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



2. Before reply could be received on behalf of the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioner, on instructions, states that his client would be content and satisfied in case her pending representation (Annexure P-9) is considered and decided by the competent authority in light of judgment rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.1638 of 2024, titled as **Mohit Sharma and Another Vs. State of H.P. and Others**, in a time bound manner.

3. Having regard to the nature of prayer made in the instant petition and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity to call for the reply on behalf of the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, who while accepting notice on behalf of the respondents, fairly states that pending representation, if any, filed by the petitioner shall be decided expeditiously in accordance with law.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation (Annexure P-9) of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the



petitioner and pass detailed speaking order thereupon taking note of the judgment rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in Mohit Sharma case (supra), wherein issue otherwise sought to be decided in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate court of law, if she still remains aggrieved.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

April 07, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)