



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP No.10826 of 2025

Decided on: 7th July, 2025

Bhupinder Singh & Ors

....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

...Respondents

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

¹ *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner: Mr. Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Rajat Chaudhary, Assistant
Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Rajat Chaudhary, learned Assistant Advocate General, accepts service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

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

“1. That a writ of mandamus may kindly be issued directing the respondents to grant to the petitioner No.1 the benefit of difference of the minimum of the band pay + grade pay paid to him on his appointment on contractual basis and to which he was entitled after the pay revision w.e.f 1.1.2016 to 18.05.2017,

¹ *Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? yes*



petitioner No.2 and 3 the benefit of difference of the minimum of the band pay + grade pay paid to them on their appointment on contractual basis and to which they were entitled after the pay revision w.e.f 1.1.2016 to 27.05.2017 and petitioner Nos. 4 to 8 the benefit of difference of the minimum of the band pay + grade pay paid to them on their appointment on contractual basis and to which they were entitled after the pay revision w.e.f their respective appointment on contractual basis till the regularization of their respective services in terms of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 2056/2023 titled as Ghanshyam Dass & others versus & State of H.P & others and further the respondents be directed to release to the petitioners all the consequential benefits along with arrears at the rate of 9% per annum..."

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have represented to the respondents on 09.06.2025 (Annexure P-1 Colly.), however, the competent authority has till date not taken any call on the aforesaid representations. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioners would be content in case the respondents/competent authority(s) are directed to decide the aforesaid representations within a fixed-time schedule. Learned Assistant 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 in accordance with law 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

July 7, 2025
R.Atal