



2025:HHC:35255

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 16402 of 2025

Decided on: 17.10.2025

Akshay Kumar

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P and others

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vinay Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Sikander Bhuhan and Ms. Menka Raj Chauhan, Deputy Advocates General and Mr. Rajat Chaudhry, Assistant Advocate General, for respondents .

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Sikander Bhushan, learned Deputy Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

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

“i) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the service of the petitioner with effect from the date he completed two years of contractual service i.e. 13.10.2022 in temrs of the policy dated 28.12.2021 as per the judgment dated 22.09.2025 (Annexure P-1)

¹ Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.



ii) That the respondents may kindly be directed to consider the representation of the petitioner as per i.e. Annexure P-4 and regularize the service of the petitioner w.e.f. 13.10.2022 within time bound manner.

iii) That the respondents may kindly be directed to pay the arrears, seniority and other consequential benefits to the petitioner w.e.f. 13.10.2022 as per various judgments passed by this Hon'ble High Court.

iv) That the respondents may kindly be directed to count the contract service rendered by the petitioner for all the benefits as per various judgments passed by this Hon'ble Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue raised by the petitioner have already been adjudicated upon **Uttam Ram and others versus State of H.P and others.**² The writ record does not reflect any representation having been preferred by the petitioner to the respondents for the redressal of his grievance in light of Uttam Ram and others.²

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner would be satisfied, in case he is permitted to make a representation to the respondents for the redressal of grievances raised in this writ petition and the same is permitted to be decided by the respondents/ competent authority within a time bound manner. Learned Deputy Advocate General has no objection to his prayer.

² CWP No.5267 of 2025 decided on 22.09.2025.



4. In view of above, this writ petition is disposed of by permitting the petitioner to make a fresh representation to the respondents/ competent authority, within a period of two weeks from today for the redressal of his grievances, who shall in turn, consider and decide the same, in accordance with law, within a further period of four weeks. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioner. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

October 17, 2025
yogesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge