IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No.279 of 2020
Date of Decision: 14.7.2020

Harpal Singh ***……Petitioner.***

Versus

HRTC and Ors. ***....Respondents.***

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting[1]?

For the petitioner: Mr. Onkar Jairath, Advocate.
For the respondents: Mr. Vikas Rajput, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of present execution petition filed under Clause 16(1) of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh Original Side Rules, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for implementation and execution of order/judgment dated 3.5.2019, passed by the Erstwhile HP State Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 5041 of 2015, whereby the Tribunal below having taken note of the statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that his case is squarely covered by the judgment dated 25.3.2015, passed in CWP No. 648 of 2015, titled *Bansi Ram v. HRTC and Ors*, directed the respondents to consider the case of the applicant strictly in light of aforesaid judgment and grant similar benefit to him, if he is found similarly situate within a period of two months from the date of production of certified copy of the order. Since no action, whatsoever, came to be taken at the behest of the respondents pursuant to aforesaid direction issued by the Tribunal, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

Whether reporters of the Local papers are allowed to see the judgment?

2. Mr. Vikas Rajput, learned counsel for the respondents states that though he has every reason to presume that by now, order/judgment alleged to have been violated, must have been complied with in its totality, but if not, same would be definitely complied with within a period of two weeks.

3. Consequently, in view of the fair stand adopted by the learned counsel for the respondents, this Court sees no reason to keep present petition alive and accordingly, same is disposed of with direction to the respondents to do the needful in terms of judgment alleged to have been violated within a period of two weeks, failing which petitioner would be at liberty to get the present petition revived so that appropriate action in accordance with law is taken against the erring officials.

14th July, 2020 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
manjit **Judge.**