



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA

CWP No. 17296/2025
Decided on: 07.11.2025

Veena Kumari

...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors.

....Respondents.

.....
Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner:

Mr. B.R. Dhiman, Advocate.

For the respondents:

**Mr. L.N. Sharma, Additional
Advocate General.**

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, J

Notice. Mr. L.N. Sharma, learned Additional Advocate
General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. Heard.

3. The case projected by the petitioner is that: - Petitioner served as Water Carrier on daily waged basis w.e.f. 30.11.2012 to 09.04.2017 i.e. approximately four years and five months; Her services were regularized as Class-IV employee w.e.f. 10.04.2017; She continued to serve as such till 31.12.2022, which was petitioner's actual date of retirement i.e. on attaining the age of 58 years. However, at that stage, she was extended the benefit of the judgment

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



rendered in **Satya Devi Vs. State of H.P. and others.**² in consequence whereof, the petitioner continued to serve up to 31.12.2024, i.e. on attaining the age of 60 years.

The Respondents did not sanction the pension in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, she instituted **Veena Kumari Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.**³ which was disposed of with direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner in light of **Sunder Singh Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.**⁴ Pursuant to the said direction, the respondents considered the case of the petitioner and rejected the same on 08.07.2025. Petitioner feels aggrieved against the said rejection order and has preferred this writ petition.

4. Admittedly, the judgment in **Satya Devi's**² case has been assailed by the respondents by filing Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 20496/2024. The common decision passed in several other matters connected with Satya Devi's case has also been assailed by the respondents by filing separate Special Leave Petitions including **State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Vs. Inder Pal**⁵. Copy of an order passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 24.03.2025 in several connected Special Leave Petitions with lead case **State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Vs. Inder Pal**⁵ was perused which reads as under:-

²CWP No. 2274 of 2021 and connected matters. decided on 28.05.2024

³ CWP No. 9693/2025 decided on 16.6.2025

⁴Civil Appeal No. 6309 of 2017, decided on 08.03.2018

⁵Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No. 11306/2025



- “1. *Delay condoned.*
2. *Let the notice be issued to the respondent(s) in all the matters.*
3. *Tag alongwith SLP© No. 20496/2024.*
4. *In the meantime the operation of the impugned order(s) is/are stayed.”*

Petitioner's case for grant of pension by counting the service rendered by her up-to the age of 60 years is required to be considered in light of final decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Vs. Inder Pal***⁵.

Admittedly the petitioner has to her credit five years and eight months of regular service and four years & seven months of daily waged service. This service falls short from the qualifying service required in terms of the law laid down in ***Sunder Singh Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.***⁶ and ***Balo Devi & others Versus State of Himachal Pradesh and others***⁷ to become eligible for pension. The extended period of two years of service rendered by the petitioner at present cannot be reckoned towards qualifying service for the purpose of pension, in view of the law order passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Vs. Inder Pal***⁵.

⁶Civil Appeal No. 6309 of 2017, decided on 08.03.2018

⁷Civil Appeal No.4792 of 2022 decided on 18.07.2022



5. Hence, this writ petition is disposed of with the observation that petitioner's claim for counting the extended period of service rendered by her towards qualifying service for pension, in light of the law laid down in *Sunder Singh* and *Balo Devi*, shall remain subject to the final outcome of ***State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Vs Inder Pal***⁵, pending adjudication before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

7th November, 2025_(rohit)