

Amita vs. State of H.P. & others

CWP No. 274 of 2026

08.01.2026

Present: Mr. Raju Ram Rahi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Additional Advocate General,
for respondents No. 1 to 3.

Mr. Vishwajeet Singh Thakur, Advocate, for
respondent No.4.

CWP No. 274 of 2026

Taking into consideration the averments made in the
petition and submission of learned counsel for the parties, it
would be appropriate for the respondent to file reply on affidavit.
The same be filed within four weeks.

Rejoinder thereto be filed within four weeks thereafter.

List on **26.02.2026**.

Henceforth, name of Mr. Vishwajeet Singh Thakur,
Advocate, be reflected in the cause list as counsel for
respondent No.4.

CMP No. 413 of 2026

Notice and reply in aforesaid terms.

After considering the material on record and
submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, we are
of the prima facie opinion that appointment proposed to be
made in pursuance to notification dated 22.03.2019 are in
conflict with Constitutional mandate especially Article 309 of the
Constitution of India, ***State of Karnataka and others vs.
Uma Devi & others (2006) 4 SCC 1*** as well as

instructions-notifications issued by the respondents/State time to time with respect to maximum age for entering the service as well as age relaxation to the reserved categories and, therefore, though, applications in pursuance to Advertisement No. 7 of 2025, Annexure P-4, may be continued to be accepted, however, further process shall be kept in abeyance till next date.

List alongwith main petition on next date.

(Vivek Singh Thakur)
Judge

(Romesh Verma)
Judge

January 8, 2026 (Nisha)