IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20583 of 2025
Date of Decision: 29.12.2025

Smt. Nima **.....Petitioner**

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. **.....Respondents**

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Ms. Babita Chauhan, Advocate vice Mr. A.K. Gupta, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Before the issue raised in the instant petition could be heard and decided on its own merit, learned counsel representing the petitioner states that her 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 ***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 years, in a time bound manner. Learned Additional Advocate General representing the respondents 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 six weeks from today. 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 appropriate orders thereupon. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate

proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if she still remains aggrieved. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

December 29, 2025 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(sunil) **Judge**