

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA**

**CWP Nos. 18204 & 18214/2025
Decided on: 24.11.2025**

1. CWP No. 18204/2025

Mool Raj ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

2. CWP No. 18214/2025

Jallu Ram ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.Respondents.

.....
Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner(s): Mr. Rishi Tandon, Advocate.

**For the respondents: Mr.Y.P.S. Dhaulta, Additional
Advocate General and Mr. Rajat
Choudhry, Assistant Advocate
General.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua , J

Notice. Mr. Y.P.S.Dhaulta, learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents in both the writ petitions.

2. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matter is heard at this stage.

¹ *Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?* yes

These writ petitions have been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

“i) That the instant writ petition may kindly be allowed with cost and further the respondents may be directed to consider the regularization of the services of petitioner w.e.f. the date of completion of 08 years of services as per Annexure P-3 and the judgment of Rakesh Kumar & Others versus State of H.P & Others, LPA No. 165 of 2021, State of H.P and others versus Surajmani & Others.

ii) That the respondents may be directed to grant consequential benefits such as increments, dearness allowances, salary, gratuity, leave encashment as the same has been granted to the similar situated employees from their initial date of appointment with 9% interest.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that he is under instructions to state that reliefs claimed for by the petitioner(s) be treated to have been confined to conferment of work charge status on the strength of decision tendered in ***The State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Versus Surajmani & Anr.***² The other reliefs claimed by the petitioner(s) is treated to have been denied. Accordingly, the petitioner(s) have been heard as having been instituted for claiming relief of work charge status on the said decision rendered in ***Surajmani.***² Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner(s) would be satisfied in case the respondents are directed to examine their case in light of the aforesaid judgment within a fixed time schedule. Learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to this prayer.

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

4. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, these writ petitions are disposed of with direction to respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the case of the petitioner(s) in accordance with law laid down in ***Surajmani***² within a period of six weeks from today. The decision so arrived at shall also be communicated to the petitioner(s).

The writ petitions stand disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

24th November, 2025_(yogesh)