

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18393 of 2025
Date of Decision: 27.11.2025

Ranjit KumarPetitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Naresh Kaul and Ms. Sheetal Kaul,
Advocates.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr.
Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar,
Additional Advocate Generals with Mr.
Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

By way of instant petition, petitioner has prayed for
following main relief:-

“i. That the respondents may be ordered to grant work charge status to
the petitioner, on completion of 8 years service, with all benefits
incidental therein, in the interest of law and justice.”

2. Though by way of filing reply, claim as put forth in the
petition, has been refuted by the respondents, but before case at hand
could be heard and decided on its own merit, learned counsel
representing the petitioner states that his client would be content and
satisfied in case directions are issued to the respondents to consider and
decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment dated 06.02.2025
passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No.1595 of 2025, titled

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

State of ***Himachal Pradesh and others vs. Surajmani and others***, wherein it has been reiterated that daily wage employee shall be entitled to work charge status on his/her having completed eight years continuous service with a minimum of 240 days in each calendar year, in a time bound manner. Learned Additional Advocate General is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

3. Having perused the averments contained in the petition as well as relief prayed therein vis-à-vis judgment sought to be relied upon, this Court finds that the issue raised in the instant petition already stands adjudicated by Division Bench of this Court as well as Hon'ble Apex Court and as such, no prejudice would be caused to either of the parties, if the respondents are directed to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of judgment supra.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in light of aforesaid judgment expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of instant order shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass detailed speaking order thereupon. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 27, 2025
Manjit