IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

COPC No. 1085/2025
Decided on: 27.04.2026

Dharam Pal ..…Petitioner

Versus

Ashish Singhmar & Ors. …….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner : Mr. Jagdish Thakur, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Rajat Choudhary, Assistant Advocate General.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, J.

Petitioner alleges contempt on part of the respondents in not implementing ***Dharam Pal Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.***[2]

Following directions were issued in ***Dharam Pal***[2]: -

"16. In view of aforesaid facts and circumstances and also considering the claim of petitioner for similar treatment like Bimla Devi, respondents-State is directed to give daily wager status to petitioner from the date when he completed 10 years of continuous service as Part Time Worker i.e. from 30.1.2010 instead of 8.8.2012 and also to consider him for regularization from the date of completion of 8 years continuous service with 240 days in each calender year and in case, post is not available, then to confer work charge status on completion of 8 years of service with all consequential benefits. It is further clarified that in case Bimla Devi has been regularized after completion of 7 years daily waged service, then petitioner shall also be given similar treatment.

---

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

2 CWPOA No. 7473/2020 decided on 30.07.2024

Petition is allowed and disposed of with aforesaid terms with direction to extend the benefits to petitioner as expeditiously as latest within three months from today."

2. Respondents have filed the compliance affidavit. Pursuant to the orders passed in this petition, instructions have also been placed on record by the respondents. It is not in dispute that the judgment stands implemented; Work charge status has been conferred upon the petitioner on completion of eight years of service on parity vis-à-vis Bimla Devi. Petitioner's only grievance is that the monetary benefits as part of the consequential benefits have not been released to him, in accordance with the judgment.

3. The office order dated 13.11.2025, passed by the respondents towards compliance of the judgment and placed on record as Annexure R-2 along with office instructions dated 08.12.2025, *inter alia*, records that the same was passed not only in compliance with the directions issued in ***Dharam Pal***[2] but also in terms of the judgment rendered in ***The State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. Versus Surajmani & Anr.***[3] The said order expressly records that the pay fixation in the case of the petitioner has been carried out on notional basis in view of the directions issued in *Surajmani*[3] .

4. Though learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that ***Dharam Pal***[2] has attained finality, and, therefore, the respondents are

[3] Civil Appeal No.1595 of 2025, decided alongwith connected civil appeals on 06.02.2025

liable to release actual monetary benefits towards consequential benefits to the petitioner, however in given case, keeping in view the office order dated 13.11.2025, the respondents cannot be held to be in contempt of the directions *stricto sensu*. Accordingly, the present proceedings are closed. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged. Liberty, however, is reserved to the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy for the redressal of his surviving grievances, if any, in accordance with law. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

27th April, 2026
(rohit)