IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20723 of 2025

Date of Decision: 30.12.2025

Karan .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the Petitioner:	Mr. Bonit Thakur, Advocate vice Mr. A.K. Gupta, Advocate.
For the Respondents:	Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General, Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Before reply, if any, could be called for from the respondents, 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 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 **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

---

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

counsel appearing for the respondents is not averse to aforesaid innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioner.

2. 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.

3. Consequently, in view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide 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

December 30, 2025
manjit