

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition (T) No. 131 of 2026

Date of Decision: 22.09.2026

Chanderkant Sharma & others Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & others ... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioners: Ms. Deep Mala Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar,
Additional Advocate Generals with Mr. Ravi
Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy
Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant Execution Petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioners for issuance of directions to the respondents to implement/ execute the order/judgment dated 22.12.2023 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWPOA No. 4171 of 2019, titled **Kashmir Chand & others vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others** alongwith connected matters.

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid order/judgment, sought to be executed in the instant proceedings, reveals that Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, while allowing the petition, held petitioners entitled to the last pay drawn by them at the time of their services were taken over by the respondent-Department as a measure personal to them as has also been done by the respondents-Department in the case of

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

similarly situated persons in terms of office orders dated 07.09.2012 and 21.07.2012. Co-ordinate Bench of this Court further held that petitioners are entitled for same parity with regard to the fixation of the salary as has been done by the Department in the case of incumbents referred to in office orders dated 07.09.2012 and 21.07.2012 (Annexure P-5 colly in CWPOA No.4320 of 2019). The fixation of pay as well as benefits of revision thereof shall be given to the petitioners from the date, their services were taken and needful be done within a period of 90 days. Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note hereinabove, respondents have failed to do so, petitioners have approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, while accepting notice on behalf of the respondents, states that though he has every reason to believe and presume that by now aforesaid judgment/ order must have been complied with, but if not, same would be complied with within a period of three weeks from today.

4. Consequently, in view of the fair statement made by learned Additional Advocate General, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive and as such, same is accordingly disposed of with the direction to the respondents to do the needful in terms of order/judgment dated 22.12.2023 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, positively within a period of three weeks, if not already done, failing which, petitioners would be at liberty to get the

present proceedings revived, so that appropriate action, in accordance with law, is taken towards implementation of the judgment/ order, sought to be executed in the instant proceedings.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

September 22,2026
(shankar)