

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16221 of 2025

Date of Decision: 15.10.2025

Smt. Reeta Devi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & others

... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Dogra, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. Vishal Panwar Additional Advocate Generals and Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant petition, petitioner has prayed for following main reliefs:-

- “i) That a writ in the nature of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondents to re-appoint the petitioner as a Trained Graduate Teacher (Medical) and release her salary for the periods w.e.f. 14.09.2012 to 13.02.2014 alongwith interest @ 9% per annum, on the same analogy, on which, one Smt. Meena Kumari was re-appointed w.e.f.12.05.2015 under SMC-GIA policy and she is being paid her due and admissible salary regularly from the date of her re-appointment and justice be done;
- ii) To grant to the petitioner such other consequential reliefs, which the Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in facts and circumstances of the matter.”

¹ Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

2. Before notice, if any, could be issued to the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioner states that the petitioner would be content and satisfied in case direction is issued to the respondents to consider and decide her pending representation dated 20.09.2024 (Annexure P-6), in a time bound manner.

3. While putting in appearance on behalf of the respondents, Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General, fairly states that he is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court without going into the merits of the case deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation dated 20.09.2024 (Annexure P-6) of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass appropriate order, taking note of the rules occupying the fields. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

October 15, 2025
(shankar)