

Shetu Ram v. State of H.P. & Ors.
CWP No.8946 of 2026

04.06.2026 Present: Ms. Ranjana Pathania, Advocate, vice Ms. Archana Dutt, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pushpinder Jaswal, Additional Advocate General, for respondents No.1 to 3.

Ms. Komal Chaudhary, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, no case is made out, as the Court does not find anything wrong with the order. This is for the reason that it is the admitted case of the petitioner that the services of the petitioner were converted to daily wage basis on 16.02.2009 and thereafter the services of the petitioner were regularized on 02.05.2013 and subsequently the petitioner retired on 31.03.2015. Even if it is to be assumed that the benefit of superannuation at the age of 60 is to be given to the petitioner, then, also fact of the matter remain that maximum the petitioner can be construed to have served the Department shall be for a period of 3 years and 10 months approximately and as the petitioner had not put in more than 5 years of service as daily wager, obviously, the benefit of one additional year in terms of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Balo Devi's and Sunder Singh's case cannot be given to the petitioner.

Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she may be granted some time to have instructions in the matter.

List on 15.06.2026.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

June 04, 2026
(*Vinod*)