IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Ex. Pet. No.2040 of 2025 alongwith connected matters

Decided on: 29th October, 2025

---

1. Ex. Pet. No.2040 of 2025

Maili **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

2. Ex. Pet. No.2041 of 2025

Lucky **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

3. Ex. Pet. No.2042 of 2025

Budhi Maya **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

4. Ex. Pet. No.2043 of 2025

Bahadur Singh (Bhadar) **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

5. Ex. Pet. No.2044 of 2025

Mohan **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

6. Ex. Pet. No.2045 of 2025

Kalpna **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

7. Ex. Pet. No.2046 of 2025

Gorimaya **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

8. Ex. Pet. No.2047 of 2025

Kanchhi **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

9. Ex. Pet. No.2048 of 2025

Chamba **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

10. Ex. Pet. No.2049 of 2025

Tara Devi **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

11. Ex. Pet. No.2050 of 2025

Railman **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

---

12. Ex. Pet. No.2051 of 2025

Lal Bahadur **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and others **.....Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioners: Mr. Bonit Thakur, Advocate vice Mr. A.K. Gupta, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Vishwadeep Sharma, Additional Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

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

2. Learned Additional Advocate General has placed on record copies of separate office orders passed by the competent authority of the respondent-Public Works Department, conferring work charge status upon the respective petitioners retrospectively on notional basis on completion of their 08 years of daily wage service. Learned Additional Advocate General submits that wherever pay fixation has not been done by the respondents, the same

---

[1] **Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.**

shall also be carried out within four weeks from today based upon the aforesaid office orders.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that in view of the office orders now passed by the respondents, the present execution petitions be closed, however, liberty be reserved to the petitioners to seek appropriate remedy for the redressal of their surviving grievances, if any, in accordance with law.

In view of the office orders placed on record by the respondents and the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s), the present execution petitions are disposed of with liberty as prayed for.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

October 29, 2025
Mukesh