IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.4755 of 2026

Decided on: 28.04.2026

Jagat Singh .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ... Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner : Mr. Hemant Kumar Thakur, Advocate vice Mr. Rajesh K. Sharma, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Pushpender Jaswal, Addl. AG.

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge *(Oral)*

Notice. Mr. Pushpender Jaswal, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. By way of this petition, the petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-

> *"i) That in view of the facts and circumstances mentioned hereinabove in this writ petition, the respondents may kindly be directed to re-engage the service of the petitioner in respondent department forthwith, in the interest of justice.*
>
> *ii) That in alternative of prayer No. (i) the respondents may kindly be directed to decide the representations of*

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

2026:HHC:13820

the present petitioner in a time bound manner."

3. A perusal of the writ petition demonstrates that in terms of the averments made therein, the petitioner was engaged as a Daily Wage Beldar, in the year 2004 and his services were verbally terminated in the month of August, 2004. According to the petitioner, thereafter he took up the matter by approaching the Hon'ble Chief Minister in the year 2019 as also with the Authorities concerned but till date, nothing has been done.

4. Having heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and having perused the averments made in the petition as also the documents appended therewith, this Court is of considered view that the petition is grossly hit by delay and laches. The cause of action in the present case had arisen in favour of the petitioner in month of August, 2004, when, as per petitioner, his services were allegedly verbally terminated.

5. There is no plausible explanation in the petition as to why the petitioner approached the Hon'ble Chief Minister after a gap of 15 years as from the date of his termination and further as to why this petition has been filed after a lapse of 22 years. Obviously, the claim raised by the petitioner now has become dead and stale and therefore, this Court is of the considered view that it would not be in the interest of justice to seek a reply from the respondents as the

2026:HHC:13820

petition undoubtedly is hit by delay and laches.

In view of above discussion, this petition is dismissed being hit by delay and laches. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

April 28, 2026
(*narender*)