

Sonika Thakur vs. State of H.P. & Ors.

CWP No.10480 of 2023.

25.08.2026 Present: Mr. Vikrant Chandel, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Pal Thakur, Additional Advocate General, for the respondents-State.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and also learned Additional Advocate General and having perused the writ petition as well as the replies filed by respondents No. 1 and 2, on one hand, and respondent No. 3, on the other hand, this Court is of the considered view that respondents No. 1 and 2 have to clarify as to whether the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of instructions dated 14th October 2022, Annexure P-3, or not. Said respondents cannot simply say that because the petitioner is an employee of respondent No.3, therefore, the petition is not maintainable against respondents No.1 and 2.

As the instructions in issue upon which the petitioner is relying are issued by respondents No.1 and 2, they owe a duty to the Court to inform as to whether the petitioner is covered under the

instructions or not. Needful be done by the next date
of hearing.

List on 17th September, 2026.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

25th August, 2026.
(Jai)