

Lajwanti Versus State of H.P. & Ors.

CWP No.7806 of 2024

09.03.2026 Present: Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate, vice Mr. Davinder Chauhan Jaita, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. R.P. Singh, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents No.1 to 3.
Mr. Manohar Lal Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Heard for some time. The grievance of the petitioner is with regard to discrimination which is being meted out by the Authorities as far as the grant of salary to the petitioner is concerned.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has referred to Annexures P-1 and P-2, appended with the petition and submitted that a perusal of Annexure P-1 would demonstrate that after the appointment of the petitioner, she was employed with Medical Superintendent-cum-Member Secretary, Rogi Kalyan Simti, DDU Zonal Hospital, Shimla and despite the fact that in terms of Annexure P-2, the Rogi Kalyan Simti (RKS) of IGMS Hospital, Shimla, vide Office Order dated 18.05.2016 enhanced the emoluments of Rogi Kalyan Simti employees, who have completed eight years of service as on 31.03.2016, the petitioner has been discriminated and she has not been given the benefits of

enhanced emoluments simply because she was serving in DDU Hospital and not in IGMC, Shimla.

This Court is of the considered view that as DDU Hospital is also a Government Hospital and the services of the petitioner were deployed in the Rogi Kalyan Simti, if there was any different Rogi Kalyan Simti at DDU Hospital at Shimla, it should have followed this rule by issuing a similar Office Order, as was done by the IGMC, Rogi Kalyan Simti on 18.05.2016 or if the Rogi Kalyan Simti was common for both the Hospitals, then the benefit of the Office Order should have been given to the petitioner also.

At this stage, learned Deputy Advocate General submits that he may be granted some time to have instructions. As prayed for, list on **25.03.2026**. Instructions in the meanwhile.

Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

March 09, 2026
(Rishi)