



2025:HHC:21988

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.10912 of 2025

Decided on: 9th July, 2025

Kishan Chand

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Ms. Salochna Rana, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General
with Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional
Advocate General, for respondents
No.1, 2, 4 and 5-State.

Mr. Tek Ram Sharma, Advocate, for
respondent No.3.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. L.N. Sharma, learned Additional
Advocate General and Mr. Tek Ram Sharma, learned
counsel, appear and waive service of notice on behalf of
respondents No.1, 2, 4 & 5 and respondent No.3,
respectively.

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

¹Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.



- “(i). That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondents to grant the promotional increments to the petitioner from the due date when he was promoted to the post of Head Teacher, with all consequential benefits.*
- (ii). That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondents to grant all the service benefits to the petitioner as are admissible under the service rules.*
- (iii). That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondents to grant/release the promotional increments to the petitioner like the similar persons in CWP No.2500 of 2021 titled as Ranjit Singh and others versus State of H.P. and others alongwith connected matter (Annexure P-1) alongwith interest @ 12% per annum, within a time bound manner.”*

3. According to the petitioner, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the petitioner is that his representation dated 27.05.2025 (Annexure P-2) has still not been decided by the respondents/competent authority.

4. Once the legal principle involved in the adjudication of present petition has already been decided, it is expected from the welfare State to consider and decide the representation of the aggrieved employee within a reasonable time and not to sit over the same indefinitely compelling the employee to come to the Court for redressal of his grievances. This is also the purport and object of the Litigation Policy of the State. Not taking decision on the representation for months together would not only give rise to unnecessary multiplication of the litigation, but would



also bring in otherwise avoidable increase to the Court docket on unproductive government induced litigation.

5. In view of the above, this writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner dated 27.05.2025 (Annexure P-2) in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioner.

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

July 09, 2025
Mukesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge