



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP No.2956 of 2025

Decided on: 7th April, 2025

Guddi Devi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors

.....Respondents.

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

¹ *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner:	Mr. Subhash Mohan Snehi, Advocate.
---------------------	---------------------------------------

For the respondents:	Mr. Y.P.S.Dhaulta, Additional Advocates General.
----------------------	---

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Y.P.S.Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

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

“ i) That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondents to count - years out of total 10 years, 7 months & 16 days daily waged

¹ *Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? yes*



services of husband of the petitioner as on regular service for computing his qualifying service for pension, as per the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 6309 of 2017 titled as Sunder Singh v/s The State of Himachal Pradesh & others, decided vide order dated 08.03.2018 (Annexure P-o) as well as in Civil Appeal No. 4792/2022 (arising out of SLP (Civil) No. 18830/2021), decided on 18.07.2022 (Annexure P-7).

(ii). That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondents to release family pension we.f. 15.08.2010 with all consequential benefits alongwith up-to-date interest to the petitioner being widow of late Shri Chuni Lal, in view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 6309 of 2017 titled as Sunder Singh v/s The State of Himachal Pradesh & others, decided vide order dated 08.03.2018 (Annexure P-6) as well as in Civil Appeal No. 4792/2022 (arising out of SLP (Civil) No. 18830/2021), decided on 18.07.2022 (Annexure P-7)."

3. Admittedly, the petitioner has invoked extra ordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India without even preferring any representation to the competent authority for the redressal of her grievances raised in the writ petition.

4. Confronted with above, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner would be preferring



representation within two weeks from today. In case such a representation is so made, the same shall be decided by the competent authority in accordance with law within a period of six weeks thereafter. The order so passed shall also be communicated to the petitioner.

The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

April 7, 2025
R.Atal