

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18289 of 2025
Date of Decision: 27.11.2025

Ujwala Devi	Versus	Petitioner
State of H.P. and Others		Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Chandranarayana Singh, Dr. Nidhi Singh and Mr. Anshul Gandhi, Advocates.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General, with Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate General, for State.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Notice. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of the respondents.

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

3. This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

“i) Issue a writ of mandamus or other appropriate writ order or direction, directing the respondents to regularize the contractual service of the petitioner on the post of Female Health Worker after completion of two years of contractual service i.e. w.e.f. 08.03.2018 at Civil Hospital Karsog, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh, with all consequential benefits and re-fix the pay of the petitioner and release the arrears in her favour along with 9% interest within time bound manner on the post of Assistant Farm Manager in terms of

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

Regularization policy of the Respondent State with all consequential benefits.

- ii) *Issue a writ of Mandamus or other appropriate writ order or direction, by directing the respondents to pay the equal pay and perks to Petitioner on the post of Female Health Worker (Rastriya Bal Swasthya Karyakram (RBSK) (NHM.H.P.) from the initial date of her appointment Or after completion of Two years of contractual service as paid to Female Health Worker/regular employees in the Respondent department in terms of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in India with all consequential benefits."*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that issue raised by petitioner and reliefs claimed herein have already been adjudicated in **CWPOA No. 3621 of 2019**, titled as **Anuradha Thakur v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.**, **CWP No. 814 of 2020**, titled as **Mohan Singh and Ors v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.** and CWP No.4971 of 2024, titled as **Nitin Thakur Versus State of H.P. and others** alongwith connected matters.

6. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner would be satisfied in case the respondents/competent authority(s) are directed to consider the case of the petitioner in light of the **Anuradha Thakur** and **Mohan Singh** cases (supra). Learned Additional Advocate General has no objection to the aforesaid prayer.

7. Having regard to the afore-submissions, but without examining the merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with direction to the respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of **Anuradha Thakur** and **Mohan Singh** cases (supra), by passing appropriate order within a period of six weeks

from today. Copy of the order so passed, be also communicated to the petitioner.

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

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 27, 2025
manjit