

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

COPC No.596 of 2025
Decided on: 29.09.2026

Pritam Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Dr. Ashwani Kumar and Ors.

....Respondents

Coram :

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge

¹ *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner : Ms. Rajni Gandhi, Advocate.

For the respondents : Ms. Rahul Thaku, Deputy
Advocate General, for the
respondents-State.

Ranjan Sharma, Judge

Petitioner, has invoked the contempt jurisdiction of this Court, alleging non-compliance of the judgment dated 29.07.2024, passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CWPOA No. 7497 of 2020, titled **Pritam Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and Others**. The operative part of the judgment dated 29.07.2024, reads as under:

51. In view of aforesaid discussion, respondents are directed to pass an appropriate order on or before 30.09.2024 to confer work charge status/regularization upon the petitioner from 01.01.2000, on which date he had

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

completed 8 years of continuous service as daily wage worker with 240 days in each calendar year along with all consequential benefits till his regularization. Arrears of the consequential benefits be extended to the petitioner on or before 31.12.2024, failing which petitioner shall also be entitled for interest thereon, at the rate of 5 % per annum from the date of filing of the petition, till final payment and in that eventuality, interest after payment of the same to the petitioner, shall be recovered from erring official(s) responsible for causing delay and after receiving it shall be deposited in the Treasury, within four weeks thereafter.

3. Upon issuance of notice in present proceedings on 02.07.2025, Respondent Additional Chief Secretary (IPH) filed a Reply-Affidavit on 05.03.2026.

COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT:

4. Sequel to the orders passed by this Court on 25.06.2026, Superintending Engineer, Jal Shakti Circle, Sundernagar, filed a Compliance Affidavit on 23.07.2026.

4(i) Perusal of Compliance Affidavit dated 23.07.2026 indicates that the issue regarding the conferment of work-charge status to Daily-Wagers was allowed in various writ petitions by this Court and the State Authorities,

aggrieved against the judgment passed by this Court, filed SLP (C) No. 23016 of 2023, titled **State of Himachal Pradesh & Others vs. Surajmani**, which was disposed of, by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 06.02.2025, entitling the daily-wagers for work-charge status from the date of completion of 8 years of continuous daily-wage service on notional basis.

4(ii). Compliance Affidavit indicates that State Authorities being aggrieved against the judgment dated 29.07.2024, in the present case, filed a SLP (C) Diary No. 5000 of 2025 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, titled as **State of Himachal Pradesh & Others vs. Pritam Singh**, which was disposed of by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 21.03.2025, with the findings that the issue involved in case of Pritam Singh is the same and therefore, the directions passed in Special Leave Petitions in case of Surajmani (Supra) shall govern the disposal of the case of Pritam Singh also.

WORK-CHARGE STATUS GRANTED:

4(iii) Compliance Affidavit states that, sequel of the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) Diary No. 5000 of 2025, decided on 21.03.2025, the State Authorities

have granted work-charge status to the w.e.f. 01.01.2000 notionally, in terms of the mandate in the case of Surajmani (Supra) vide order dated 29.07.2025, **[Annexure R-4]**.

PAY-FIXED NOTIONALLY AFTER GIVING WORK-CHARGE STATUS:

4(iv) Compliance Affidavit indicates that upon grant of work-charge status to the petitioner w.e.f. 01.01.2000, the pay has also been fixed notionally as per order dated 02.08.2025 **[Annexure R-5]**.

BENEFIT OF ENHANCED KGE OF SUPERANUATION GRANTED:

4(v) Compliance Affidavit indicates that in terms of Full Bench judgment in the case of Baldev, the petitioner has been given the benefit of the deemed enhanced age of retirement from 58 to 60 years, upto to 28.02.2019 vide order dated 03.08.2025 **[Annexure R-5]** and the petitioner has been granted two notionally increments for said enhanced retirement age vide order dated 22.07.2024, **[Annexure R-6]**.

REVISED RETIRAL BENEFITS RELEASED:

4(vi) Compliance Affidavit further indicates that upon grant of notionally benefits as per the judgment in the case of Surajmani and Pritam Singh (supra) the retiral

benefits have also been revised, and differential amount of DCRG of Rs. 53,312 has been calculated on 28.04.2026 as per [Annexure R-7] and admissible amount has been released to the petitioner. Reply affidavit further indicates that revised pension arrears amounting to ₹ 3,41,652, has been released on 23.06.2026 **[Annexure R-8]**. In above backdrop, the Compliance Affidavit states that the judgment passed by this Court stands complied with.

DIRECTIONS:

5. Considering the matter in above perspective, this Court is of the considered view, that though the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court has passed a judgment on 29.07.2024, against which an SLP (C) Diary No. 5000 of 2025, was filed, therefore action of the State Authorities in pursuing its remedies before the Hon'ble Supreme Court which led to passing of the judgment in SLP on 21.03.2025, does not amount to willful and intentional disobedience of the judgment passed by this Court. Pertinently after the decision of SLP on 21.03.2025 the State Authorities have granted the admissible benefits [as detailed in Para 4 (iii) to (iv) above] to the petitioner in terms of the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court by applying the

directions passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Surajmani (supra) which were directed to be followed governed in case of petitioner, Pritam Singh. Material on record reveals that after the decision of SLP, in case of the petitioner on 21.03.2025, the Respondents have made earnest efforts towards implementation, as discussed above. In these circumstances, the action of Respondents cannot be construed as contumacious.

6. Resultantly, in above backdrop, this Court gives a quietus to the present proceedings.

7. As prayed, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy, in case, any grievances alike survives, hereinafter, in accordance with law.

In aforesaid terms, instant petition and all the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

September 29, 2026
(Anita)