



2025:HHC:22478

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**CWP No.11135 of 2025**

**Decided on: 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025**

-----  
Girdhari Lal

.....**Petitioner**

**Versus**

State of H.P. and others

.....**Respondents**  
-----

**Coram**

**Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua**

**Whether approved for reporting?<sup>1</sup>**

For the Petitioner: Ms. Archana Dutt, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General  
with Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. B.C.  
Verma, Additional Advocates General.

-----  
**Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge**

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

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

*“(i) That the respondents may kindly be directed to  
consider the case of the petitioner for grant of the pay  
scale of Rs.1640-2925 as is prescribed to the post of  
Shastri Teacher instead of pay scale of Rs.1500-2700  
as was granted to them on his initial appointment with  
all consequential benefits and arrears accrued  
thereunder may very kindly be ordered to be released*

-----  
<sup>1</sup>Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.



*with interest @ 9% per annum in the interest of justice as has been granted by this Hon'ble Court in Madan Lal's case.*

- (ii) *That the respondents may be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner filed on 02.07.2025 Annexure P-2 in the interest of justice and fair play."*

**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 02.07.2025 (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 02.07.2025 (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 11, 2025  
*Mukesh*

Jyotsna Rewal Dua  
Judge