

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

**CWP No.18517 of 2025
Date of Decision: 28.11.2025**

Shri Tapender Singh and Ors.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Anr.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioners: Mr. Onkar Jairath, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of instant petition, petitioners have prayed for following main reliefs:

“i. That the writ in the nature of Mandamus may very kindly be issued, to the respondents to consider the case of the Petitioners to be deemed appointed on regular basis with effect from their initial date of contractual basis, appointment on notwithstanding that their appointments were initially made on contract basis at a time when no such provision existed under the Recruitment & Promotion Rules of 1987 which were then force.

ii. That the Petitioners may kindly be given the Earned leave and other service benefits as is being given to the regular appointed Craft Instructors. The petitioners may also be held entitled for all the allowances which are being paid to the regular Craft Instructors and the respondents may be directed to pay the same alongwith interest to the Petitioners.”

2. Before reply, if any, could be called for from the respondents, learned counsel representing the petitioners, while inviting attention of this Court to judgment passed by this Court in **CWP No. 7602 of 2010** titled as **Om Parkash v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors. alongwith connected matters** as well as **instructions dated 23.8.2025 issued by the Director of School Education (Annexure P-8)**, states that issue raised in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated by this Court in **Om Parkash** (*supra*) and as such, petitioners would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide representation of the petitioners (Annexure P-9) in light of aforesaid judgment in a time bound manner.

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

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 representation of the petitioners (**Annexure P-9**) in light of **Om Parkash** and instructions dated 23.8.2025 (Annexure P-8) (*supra*), 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 petitioners and pass appropriate orders thereafter. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

November 28, 2025
(manjit)

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**