

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.1469 of 2025
Date of Decision: 13.10.2025

Sh. Surjeet Kumar		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of H.P. and Others		Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Ms. Babita Chauhan, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar,
Additional Advocates General, with Mr. Ravi
Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, for State.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Reply filed on behalf of respondents, if perused in its entirety, clearly reveals that petitioner has been granted relief, as prayed for in the instant petition.

2. Precisely, the claim of the petitioner, as came to be put forth in the petition is/was that he is not being granted work charge status, after his having completed more than eight years of daily wage service with 240 days in each calendar year.

3. Reply filed under the affidavit of Superintending Engineer, Jal Shakti Circle, Dharamshala, as well as documents clearly reveals that petitioner herein has been not only granted work charge status, but he has been also granted work charge status retrospectively, in terms of judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***State of Himachal Pradesh and***

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

Others vs. Surajmani and Another, Civil Appeal No.1595 of 2025, decided on 06.02.2025, along with connected civil appeals.

4. Though it has been claimed at the behest of petitioner that no arrears have been paid, but bare perusal of judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Surajmani* (supra) clearly reveals that work charge status is to be granted after completion of eight years of daily wage service, with 240 days in each calendar year, but on notional basis. Similarly, this Court finds that after grant of work charge status, pay of the petitioner has also been refixed, if it is so, nothing remains to be adjudicated in the instant proceedings and accordingly the same is disposed of, as having rendered infructuous. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in the appropriate Court of law, qua the surviving grievance, if any.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

October 13, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)