

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

CWPOA No.3157 of 2020

Decided on: 30.12.2025

Baldev Chand & Others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh
& Others

...Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge

¹*Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioners:

Mr. Chandranarayana Singh,
Advocate.

For the respondents:

Mr. Amit Kumar Chaudhary,
Deputy Advocate General, for
respondents No.1, 2 and 4 to
7-State.

Mr. Lokender Paul Thakur,
Senior Panel Counsel for
respondent No.3-Union of
India.

None for respondent No.8.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge [Oral]

Petitioners, Baldev Chand & two others,
had initially filed an Original Application i.e. OA No
5850 of 2017 before Learned Himachal Pradesh State
Administrative Tribunal and upon abolition of the
Tribunal, the same was transferred to this Court as
CWPOA No.3157 of 2020, seeking the following
relief(s):

¹ *Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

- “(i). Issue direction to the respondents to regularize the contractual service of the applications w.e.f. the due date i.e. after completion of three years of contractual services (w.e.f 11.03.2008 in the case of applicant No.1 and w.e.f. 28.07.2008 in the case of applicant No.2 and in the case of applicant No.3 w.e.f. 10.03.2008 with all consequential benefits.
- (ii). That on the grant of relief No.(i) issue direction to the respondents to pay the arrears towards the regular pay scales fixed with regard to the service of the applicants by the government of India with interest @ 12% p.a., towards the arrears within the time bound manner, for all intents and purposes.
- (iii). The Respondents No.1 to 7 be directed to pay the arrears due to the applicants in terms of the notification Dated 01.04.2013 with regard to revised pay scale w.e.f. 01.04.2013 (Rs.12000/- to Rs.15000/- plus existing increment with 10% annual increment) with up to date interest @ 12% within a time bound manner.”

2. Pursuant to the issuance of notice on 21.11.2017, State Authorities have filed a Reply-Affidavit. Even the rejoinder was filed by the petitioners.

3. At this stage, Learned Counsel for the

petitioners states that an identical issue has been decided by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP No.814 of 2020** and other connected matters, titled **Mohan Singh and Ors. versus State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.**, decided on 27.10.2025, whereby the claim of the petitioners therein were allowed in terms of the judgment rendered by this Court in **Nitin Thakur versus State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.** [CWP No.4971 of 2024, decided on 23.09.2025]. Learned Counsel further submits that based on the judgment in the case of **Mohan Singh** and **Nitin Thakur**, Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP No.18820 of 2025** along with connected matter, titled **Ishwar Singh versus State of H.P. and others**, decided on 02.12.2025 has directed the State Authorities to consider and decide the case of the petitioners in accordance with law after taking into account the aforesaid judgments.

4. Prayer made by Learned Counsel for the petitioner being innocuous is not opposed by Learned State Counsel also who submits that the matter with

respect to the applicability of the judgments, subject to finality and the factual aspects need to be looked into/verified by the State Authorities.

5. Taking into account the entirety of the facts and circumstances and the statement made by Learned Counsel for the petitioner and leaving all questions upon, this Court disposes of the instant petition in the following terms:

- (i). State Authorities shall consider and decide the case of the petitioners in light of the judgments in the case of **Nitin Thakur, Mohan Singh** and **Ishwar Singh** (*supra*) by passing an appropriate orders in accordance with law, within six weeks from today;
- (ii). Upon consideration, in case, the petitioner is found similarly placed, admissible benefits be extended to the petitioner also;
- (iii). *Needless to say*, that this Court has not adverted to the rival claims and contentions which are left to be examined by the State Authorities independently in accordance with law;
- (iv). Parties to bear respective costs.

In view of the above, the instant petition is disposed of along with pending miscellaneous

application(s), if any.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

December 30, 2025
[Shivender]