

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**CWP Nos.11109, 11110, 11112,
11113, 11114, 11115 of 2025

Date of decision: 11.07.2025

1. CWP No.11109 of 2025

Kusam Kumari ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of HP and Ors. ...Respondents.

2. CWP No.11110 of 2025

Surinder Paul ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of HP and Ors. ...Respondents.

3. CWP No.11112 of 2025

Mohinder Pal ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of HP and Ors. ...Respondents.

4. CWP No.11113 of 2025

Raj Kumar Kaushal ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of HP and Ors. ...Respondents.

5. CWP No.11114 of 2025

Satish Kumar ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of HP and Ors. ...Respondents.

6. CWP No.11115 of 2025

Sushma Kumari ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of HP and Ors. ...Respondents.

Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes



Coram:

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioners : Raj Thakur, Advocate.

For the respondent(s) : Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. B.C. Verma, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. These writ petitions have been filed for the grant of almost identical reliefs. The substantive reliefs in CWP No.11109 of 2025 read as under:-

- “i. That the respondents may kindly be directed to grant third financial enhancement/ upgradation under the new ACPS on the completion of 14 years of service of petitioner, with all consequential benefits.*
- ii. That the respondents may kindly be further directed to calculate the arrears on account of grant of third financial enhancement/ upgradation under the new ACPS (4/ 9/ 14) along with interest @ 12% per annum.*
- iii. That the respondents may kindly be directed to produce the entire record pertaining to the case, for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.”*

3. According to the petitioners, the legal issue involved in the cases has already been adjudicated upon. The



grievance of the petitioners is that their respective representations have 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 above, these writ petitions are disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the respective representations of the petitioners, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioners.



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

11th July, 2025
(Pardeep)

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge