

State of H.P. & Anr. Vs. Sumeet Kumar & Anr.

LPA No.189 of 2026

21.07.2026 Present: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. P.K Nadda, Additional Advocate General, for the applicant-petitioner.

LPA No.189 of 2026

At this stage, it has been noticed that in order dated 07.04.2026 passed in CMP.M No.1510 of 2025, it has been inadvertently recorded that appeal was being filed against acquittal of respondents whereas appeal has been filed against judgment passed by the Single Bench in service matter in favour of the respondents. The said ministerial mistake could not be corrected at the time of signing the order due to oversight.

The said order is directed to be corrected by mentioning that application was filed for condonation of delay in filing the appeal against the judgment passed by the Single Bench in favour of respondents and as such the corrected line now reads as under:

“ This application has been filed for condonation of delay of 196 days in filing appeal against judgment passed by the Single Bench in service matter in favour of the respondents.”

This line be replaced in the order uploaded on the website of High Court also. Necessary correction also be carried out by Registrar (Judicial) in the earlier order dated 07.04.2026 in this file.

Respondents, despite service are not present, however, instead of passing an adverse order, the matter is adjourned for consideration on **09.09.2026.**

CMP No.21502 of 2025

Notice in the aforesaid terms.

Learned Advocate General submits that respondents were appointed by invoking Rule 15-A of R&P Rules and there was a specific condition that increment was not available to these respondents and impugned judgment has been passed without considering Rule 15-A.

We are not impressed by these arguments, as the benefit to the respondents has been extended by the Court after regularization, but not during the currency of contract service on the basis of judgment passed by the Co-ordinate Division Bench of this Court in ***Taj Mohammad***

***and others Vs. State of H.P. and others
alongwith connected matter***, which has attained finality after dismissal of SLP preferred by the State before the Apex Court, wherein detailed judgment was passed after taking into consideration relevant R&P Rules. Therefore, it would be wrong to say that Rule 15-A of R&P Rules was not considered in that case.

Learned Advocate General has also submitted that annual increments admissible to the respondents have already been paid to them.

Further, plea of learned Advocate General that annual increments were not available to the respondents for contract period of service is also factually incorrect. From the record, it appears that increment @3% was admissible to these respondents. However, in any case, whether this increment was to be added in the basic or it was the fixed enhancement permissible to the respondents is a question to be decided in the main appeal.

Therefore, we are of considered opinion that at this stage, no case is made out for interim protection for the grounds raised for that.

List for further order on next date along
with main appeal.

(Vivek Singh Thakur)
Judge

21st July, 2026
(Kiran]

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

Hem Raj Chandel Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.

CWP No. 6587 of 2026

21.07.2026 Present: Mr. Khem Raj, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Negi, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents No.1 to 4-State.

Mr. Surender Sharma, Senior Advocate, with Mr. Siddhant Negi, Advocate, for respondent No.5-HP State Election Commission.

CWP No.6587 of 2026

For request made by learned Deputy Advocate General, matter is adjourned in terms of the order passed on previous date for consideration on **15.09.2026**.

CMP Nos.9509, 9510 and 9511 of 2026

List for consideration along with main petition on the next date.

(Vivek Singh Thakur)
Judge

21st July, 2026
(Kiran)

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge