IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA
Execution Petition No.2357 of 2026
Decided on: 04th November, 2026

Het Ram **....Petitioner**

Versus

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

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jiya Lal Bhardwaj, Judge
Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner:	Mr. Devender K. Sharma, Advocate.
For the respondents:	Mr. Hemant Kumar Verma, Deputy Advocate General.

Jiya Lal Bhardwaj, Judge *(Oral)*

Learned Deputy Advocate General has produced a copy of instructions dated 02.11.2026 and copy of office order dated 22.09.2026 passed by the Executive Engineer, Jal Shakti Division, Sundernagar, which are taken on record.

2. A perusal of the aforesaid office order reveals that the petitioner has been granted work charge status from 01.01.2000 retrospectively, which is considered for the purpose of seniority and pension and further increase in service i.e. from 58 years to 60 years. The petitioner is deemed to retire on 30.09.2014 and the total length of service rendered by him is 14 years and 09 months.

3. Since the service rendered by the petitioner is more

---

[1] *Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

than 10 years, as per the CCS Pension Rules, he has become entitled to the grant of pension from the date of retirement. The Office Superintendent has been directed to send the revised pension case of the petitioner for approval to the Accountant General, H.P.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the aforesaid order has been passed, the benefits have not been paid to him.

5. Since the competent authority has now passed the order, the petitioner is to be paid the consequential benefits.

6. No doubt, this Court while disposing of the writ petition on 10.03.2026, had only directed that the representation made by the petitioner be decided by the competent authority, but once the competent authority has taken a decision, the petitioner is entitled to the consequential benefits.

7. In view of the above and the fact that the representation made by the petitioner has duly been considered and a speaking order has been passed, the mandate contained in the judgment has duly been complied with and as such the execution petition is disposed of. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner is aggrieved by the aforesaid order and further, if the consequential benefits are not released in his favour, he may avail

an appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

8. The execution petition is accordingly disposed of. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

04th November, 2026 **(Jiya Lal Bhardwaj)**
(ankit) **Judge**