

**Chet Ram Vs. State of HP and Ors.**

**CWP No. 12844 of 2025**

**07.10.2025 Present:** Mr. Rishi Tandon, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sikandar Bhushan, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents No. 1 to 3-State.

Mr. T. R. Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.4.

It appears that the respondent-State had recommended the case of the petitioner for grant of pension and had accordingly sent his pension file to the office of respondent No.4, however, respondent has returned the same on 23.05.2025, raising some objections.

**2.** Prima-facie, objections appear to be not justified as it is the case of the petitioner that he had rendered daily wage service w.e.f. 16.07.1988 to 28.07.2014 i.e. for about 26 years and, thereafter, superannuated on 30.04.2024 after rendering 9 years, 7 months and 10 days of regular service. Prima-facie it appears that in accordance with law laid down in *Civil Appeal No.6309 of 2017 (Sunder Singh Versus The State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors)* decided on 08.03.2018 and *Civil Appeal No.4792 of 2022 (Balo Devi & others Versus*

*State of Himachal Pradesh and others*) decided on 18.07.2022, petitioner is in possession of qualifying service for the purpose of pension.

**4.** At the request of learned counsel for respondent No.4, matter is adjourned to enable him to file reply/instructions on behalf of respondent. No.4.

Reply/instructions be also placed on record by respondents No.1 to 3 by the next date of hearing.

List on **15.10.2025**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua  
Judge

October 07, 2025  
(*R.Atal*)