

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18007 of 2026

Decided on: 8th October, 2026

Souzu Ram

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others

.....**Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. A.K. Gupta and Mr. Bonit Thakur,
Advocates.

For the Respondents: Ms. Menka Raj Chauhan, Deputy
Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

Notice. Ms. Menka Raj Chauhan, learned
Deputy Advocate General, appears and waives service of
notice on behalf of the respondents.

Keeping in view the grievance of the petitioner,
the order impugned herein, the submissions made by
learned counsel for the parties, the decision being relied
upon and the nature of order being passed hereinafter,
there is no necessity to call reply from the respondents.
Matter has accordingly been heard at this stage.

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

2. Petitioner instituted CWP No.2326 of 2026 seeking work charge status on completion of eight years of service, i.e. with effect from 01.01.2001. The writ petition was disposed of on 03.03.2026 with liberty reserved to the petitioner to prefer a representation to the competent authority with further direction to the authority concerned to decide the same within the prescribed timeline.

3. Pursuant to above directions, the respondents rejected petitioner's representation on 22.05.2026 (Annexure P-2). While rejecting petitioner's prayer, the respondents have primarily observed that since the petitioner has already been conferred work charge status on completion of 10 years of service and his pay has also been enhanced at par with similarly situated persons, therefore, his prayer for conferment of work charge status on completion of 08 years of service cannot be considered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon ***The State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Versus Surajmani & Anr.***² and submits that petitioner is entitled to conferment of work charge status on completion of 08 years of service. Reliance was also placed upon office order dated 24.03.2025 (Annexure P-3), whereby the respondents

² Civil Appeal No.1595 of 2025, decided alongwith connected civil appeals on 06.02.2025

have statedly regularized the services of similarly situated persons on completion of 08 years of service, even though they had been conferred work charge status previously on completion of 10 years of service in terms of ***Mool Raj Upadhyaya versus State of H.P. and others***³.

5. In view of above, notwithstanding office order dated 22.05.2026 (Annexure P-2), this writ petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2/competent authority to consider and decide the case of the petitioner for conferment of work charge status on completion of 08 years of service afresh in accordance with law, keeping in view the decision in *Surajmani*², as also office order dated 24.03.2025 (Annexure P-3), within six weeks from today. 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.

October 08, 2026
Mukesh

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

³ 1994 Suppl (2) SCC 316