



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA

CWP No. 6616 of 2024
Decided on:26.11.2025

Neeta Devi and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioners:

**Mr. Tarun K. Sharma and
Mr. Ranbir Rathore, Advocates.**

For the respondents:

**Mr. Vishwadeep Sharma,
Additional Advocate General,
Mr. Sikander Bhushan, Deputy
Advocate General and Mr. Rajat
Choudhry, Assistant Advocate
General.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua , J

Even though the respondents have not filed reply,
however, with the consent of the parties, matter is heard at this stage.

2. This writ petition has been filed for grant of following
substantive reliefs:-

“A. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners with effect from the date of their initial engagement/appointment with all consequential benefits on the principle of equality as they are appointed on commission basis under same requisition of seats as per un-amended Rules.

B. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to release the entire consequential benefits alongwith interest @

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



9% per annum from the date of their initial appointment to till the date of realization.

C. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to extend the same and similar benefits as has been extended to Ms. Rakhi (LT), Mr. Tej Ram (LT) & Mr., Kuldip Chand (TGT, now Lecturer) who were recruited under 37.5% batch wise quota under the same requisition."

3. Petitioners grievance is that their representations of different dates (Annexure P-6, colly.) seeking applicability of ***Om Parkash versus State of Himachal Pradesh***,² ***Manju Devi versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others***³ and ***Anju Devi versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others***⁴ have not been decided till date by the respondents/competent authority. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners would be content in case the respondents/competent authority(s) are directed to consider and decide the aforesaid representations in accordance with law within a fixed-time schedule. Learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to this prayer.

4. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents/ competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representations of the petitioners of different dates (Annexure P-6, colly.) in accordance with law as well as taking into consideration the above judgments in the cases of ***Om Parkash***,²

²CWP No. 7602 of 2010, decided on 02.05.2012, alongwith connected matters.

³CWP No. 3143 of 2011, decided on 07.11.2012.

⁴ CWP No. 3144 of 2011, decided on 08.10.2012.



Manju Devi³ and Anju Devi⁴ within a period of six weeks from today.

The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioners.

The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

**Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge**

26th November, 2025_(yogesh)