



2025:HHC:40318

2025:HHC:40318

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH SHIMLA**Execution Petition No.30 of 2025****Decided on: 26th November, 2025**

Jaram Chand

....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. and others

...Respondents

*Coram***Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice****Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jiya Lal Bhardwaj, Judge***Whether approved for reporting?¹*

For the petitioner: Mr. Subhash Mohan Snehi and Ms. Bhavinta Kumari, Advocates.

For the respondents: Mr. Pranay Pratap Singh, Additional Advocate General, for the respondents-State.

G.S. Sandhawalia, Chief Justice (Oral)

The Execution was sought in respect of the order passed in **TA No.3543 of 2015** titled ***Jaram Chand vs. State of H.P. and others***, decided on 21.09.2016, by the petitioner, wherein directions were issued by the Tribunal to consider the case of the applicant for regularization on completion of 8 years of service, within two months.

2. The execution petition was earlier disposed of on 29.05.2025 by the Coordinate Bench on the ground that supplementary affidavit dated 27.05.2025 had been filed. Perusal of

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



the said affidavit would go on to show that the specific stand of the State as such was reference to various instructions. As per the earlier affidavit dated 21.05.2025, their stance was that the petitioner had been granted the benefit of regularization w.e.f. 12.09.2007 to 04.06.2017 on supernumerary basis vide order dated 20.05.2025 (Annexure R-II).

3. The execution petition was got revived on the filing of CMP-T No.342 of 2025 on the ground that the benefit of regularization of the services from the aforesaid date with all consequential benefits, had not been extended.

4. The State had specifically mentioned in its reply to the said application that the pay of the petitioner had been re-fixed vide DCF Lahaul Office Order dated 11.08.2025 and the fact that he had been granted retrospective regularization by creating supernumerary post from the date when his junior was regularized.

5. In the rejoinder filed, a new plea has now been taken that the benefit of work charge status had to be given on completion of his 8 years daily wage services from the year 2003 itself, which is thus beyond what had been ordered by the Tribunal since only his case had to be considered.

6. In Execution petition one cannot go beyond the order passed by the Tribunal and therefore, we do not find any plausible



reason to pass any fresh order in the Execution Petition.

7. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(G.S. Sandhawalia)
Chief Justice

26th November, 2025
(ankit)

(Jiya Lal Bhardwaj)
Judge