



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18189 of 2025

Date of Decision: 24.11.2025

Rajesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

HPSEBL & Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Bonit Thakur, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Virender Singh Kanwar, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, J. (Oral)

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

"a. That the respondents may be ordered to appoint the petitioner with retrospective effect i.e. w.e.f September, 2022 when the other persons were appointed and the deemed date of appointment of the petitioner may be shown as September, 2022 with all consequential benefits thereto.

b. That the respondents may kindly be directed to regularize the services of the petitioner from the date when the similar situated persons as mentioned in Annexure P-1 have been regularized."

2. Before the reply could be received from the respondents, learned counsel representing petitioner, while placing on record copy of order dated 01.02.2025, issued by Executive Director (Pers.), Himachal Pradesh State Electricity



Board Limited, Vidyut Bhawan, Shimla, thereby calling upon Superintending Engineer (OP) Circle, HPSEB Ltd, Solan, Himachal Pradesh to grant benefit to the person, namely Surjeet Kumar in terms of the mandate contained in judgment dated 26.06.2024 passed by this Court in CWP No.5811 of 2024, titled ***Surjeet Kumar vs. HPSEB Limited and others***, states that petitioner is similarly situated to aforesaid petitioner and petitioner would be content and satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment passed by this Court in ***Surjeet Kumar's case*** (supra). Learned counsel representing the respondents is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

3. Having perused the averments contained in the petition, especially relief vis-à-vis judgment sought to be relied upon, this Court finds that issue raised in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated by this Court in ***Surjeet Kumar's case*** (supra) and as such, no prejudice, if any, shall be caused to either of the parties in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of aforesaid judgment.



4. Consequently, in view of above, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment passed by this Court in **Surjeet Kumar's case** (supra) expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. 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 orders. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate court of law, if he still remains aggrieved. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

November 24, 2025
(sunil)

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge