IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No. 408 of 2020
Date of Decision: 14.10.2020

Sh. Gopal ***……Petitioner.***

Versus

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

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

For the petitioner: Mr. A.K. Gupta, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Sudhir Bhatnagar and Mr. Arvind Sharma, Additional Advocate Generals with Mr. Kunal Thakur and Ms. Savneel Jaswal, Deputy Advocate Generals.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Through Video Conferencing

By way of present execution petition filed under Clause 16(1) of the HP High Court Original Side Rules 1997, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for implementation and execution of order/judgment dated 14.03.2018, passed by the Erstwhile HP State Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 6727 of 2017, 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 31.7.2014, passed in CWP No. 2415 of 2012, titled *Mathu Ram v. Municipal Corporation and Ors*, directed

---

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

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 three 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.

2. Mr. Arvind Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, representing the respondents states that though he has every reason to presume and believe 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 six weeks from today.

3. Consequently, in view of the fair stand adopted by the learned Additional Advocate General, 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 three 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 respondents.

14th October, 2020 **(Sandeep Sharma)**
(reena) **Judge**