

**(2010) 11 SHI CK 0043**  
**In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh**  
**Case No : C.W.P. No. 7044 of 2010**

Revti Raman and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State of H.P. and Others

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 11-11-2010

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation :** (2010) 11 SHI CK 0043

**Hon'ble Judges :** Kurian Joseph, C.J;V.K. Sharma, J

**Bench :** Division Bench

---

## Judgement

Kurian Joseph, C.J.—Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that this issue is squarely covered by the judgment rendered by this Court on 26th May, 2010 in CWP No. 2525 of 2010, Neelam Chauhan v. State of H.P. and Ors. The text of the judgment reads as under:

1. The Petitioners in these writ petitions are aggrieved since they are not able to reap the fruits of orders passed by this Court regarding the vacation salary. It appears that the Government had initially decided to grant the benefit but it is seen that the same has been withdrawn as per Annexure P-3 on the ground that the State has decided to take up the matter to the Supreme Court. We are informed that the State has already filed SLP against the order dated 1.9.2008, passed in CWP No. 144 of 2000.
2. According to the learned Counsel for the Petitioners, the SLP has not even been registered before the Apex Court and the Petitioners seek the benefit of order dated 1.9.2008, which the State initially had decided to implement. Apparently, the non-implementation is only on account of their decision to move the Supreme Court. It is also submitted that since the SLP has not even been admitted and since there is no interim order, there is no justification in not granting the benefit to the Petitioners at least making it subject to the outcome of the matter now pending before the Supreme Court. It is further submitted that the Petitioners are undertaking that they will refund the amount in case the Supreme Court takes a decision in favour of the State.

3. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioners and learned Senior Additional Advocate General and having regard to the factual position, we are of the view that the dispute in these cases can be given quietus in case the Petitioners give undertaking that in the event of the Supreme Court deciding in favour of the State, the money so received will be remitted back with 10% interest. Therefore, in the event of the Petitioners giving undertaking that they would refund the amount received by way of vacation salary with 10% interest in the event of the State winning before the Supreme Court, they shall be disbursed the vacation salary within a month of the execution of the undertaking. Needless to say that Annexure P-3 shall not stand in the way of disbursing the salary, as above.

2. There will be a direction to the Respondents to extend the same benefit to the Petitioners herein also in case the Petitioners herein are also similarly situated as the Petitioners in the case supra.

3. The writ petition is disposed of, so also the pending applications.