

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.11306 of 2026

Decided on: 16th July, 2026

Ravinder Kumar

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

Himachal Road Transport Corporation
and others

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Rupesh Kumar and Mr. Parav
Sharma, Advocates.

For the Respondents: Mr. Abhinav M. Goel, Advocate vice
Mr. Raman Jamalta, Advocate.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Mr. Abhinav M. Goel, Advocate vice
Mr. Raman Jamalta, learned Standing Counsel, appears
and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. The case set up by the petitioner is that he was
engaged as Conductor on contract basis in the respondent-
Corporation as an Ex-serviceman on 12.12.2016. His
services were regularized w.e.f. 08.07.2021 vide office order
dated 17.07.2021. Petitioner's grievance is to the office
order dated 22.05.2026 (Annexure P-6), holding that the

¹ Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.

petitioner does not fulfil the criteria prescribed in the Demobilized Armed Forces Personnel (Reservation of vacancies in the Himachal State Non-Technical Services) Rules, 1972. Accordingly, petitioner's pay was re-fixed w.e.f. 08.07.2021.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned office order dated 22.05.2026 has been passed without issuing any notice to the petitioner in violation of the principles of natural justice. Learned counsel further submitted that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the decision rendered in ***Dilbag Singh Versus HRTC & Ors.***². Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner would be satisfied in case he is permitted to make a representation to the respondents/competent authority for redressal of his grievances and directions are issued to the said authority to decide the same in accordance with law within a fixed time schedule.

Learned vice counsel appearing for the respondents though is not averse to this prayer, however, submits that adequate opportunity was granted to the petitioner by the respondent-Corporation before issuing the impugned office order.

² CWP No.11982/2024, decided on 28.04.2025

4. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of by permitting the petitioner to file a representation to the respondents/competent authority within two weeks from today, whereafter, the same shall be considered and decided by the said authority in accordance with law keeping in view of the applicable Rules as also the aforesaid decision rendered in *Dilbag Singh*², within a period of six weeks thereafter. The decision so arrived at 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.

July 16, 2026
Mukesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge