



2025:HHC:40127

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18263 of 2025

Date of Decision: 26.11.2025

Vikas		Petitioner
	Versus	
HRTC and Another		Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Sat Prakash, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Precisely, the grouse of the petitioner as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by Mr. Sat Prakash, learned counsel for the petitioner, is that petitioner, who was initially appointed as TMPA with the respondent-Corporation, has not been paid his admissible dues despite repeated requests.

2. As per the averments contained in the petition, petitioner served respondent-Corporation for a period of six years (three years on contract basis and four years on regular basis) and thereafter, he joined the Education Department. Petitioner herein tendered his resignation in the year 2024 from the post of TMPA, but till date, he has been not released amount, if any, on account of leave encashment, Night Over Time allowances, compensatory leave

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



benefits and other allowances etc., and as such, has approached this Court in the instant proceedings, praying therein for following main relief:-

“1. Issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to grant and release all pending service benefits alongwith all consequential benefits i.e. Night Over Time allowances, compensatory leave benefits, leave encashment payments and earned leave benefit, pay commission arrears and Dearness Allowance in the interest of justice and fair play.”

3. Before notice, if any, could be issued in the instant proceedings, Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate, representing the respondents, while referring to the pending representation of the petitioner, fairly states that same shall be decided expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. He states that in case petitioner is found eligible to the amount, sought to be released, same shall be released without any delay.

4. Having regard to the nature of the prayer, coupled with the fair statement made by learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation, there appears to be no justification to call for reply on behalf of the respondents and as such, present petition is disposed of, with a direction to the respondent-Corporation to ensure that representation filed by the petitioner is decided expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks and in case, petitioner is



found entitled to the amount as per the representation, same shall be released to him expeditiously, preferably within a period of eight weeks. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 26, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)