IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

Execution Petition(T) No. 431 of 2020
Decided on: October 30, 2020

Pritam Singh Parihar ...**Petitioner**

Versus

The Himachal Pradesh Tourism Development Corporation Limited and another ...**Respondents**

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

For the petitioner: Mr. O.P. Goel, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Naresh Kaul, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of instant execution petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for execution of order dated 24.4.2019 passed by erstwhile Himachal Pradesh Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 1646 of 2019 titled as Pritam Singh Parihar vs. Himachal Pradesh Tourism Development Corporation and another, whereby learned Tribunal below, having taken note of the statement made on behalf of learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner that his case is squarely covered by judgment dated 17.7.2014 rendered by this Court in CWP No. 3050/2014, Nek Ram vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others, disposed of the Original Application with a direction to the respondents to extend benefit of aforesaid judgment to the petitioner within two months, subject to his being similarly

---

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

situate person. Since no action came to be taken in the matter after lapse of considerable period, petitioner has filed the instant petition for execution of order in question. Though it stands averred in the petition that a sum of Rs.10.00 Lakh stands released to the petitioner on account of gratuity but since due and admissible interest on account of delayed payment has not been released to the petitioner, he has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

2. Mr. Naresh Kaul, learned counsel for the respondents, while accepting notice on behalf of the respondents, states that though the order sought to be executed stand duly implemented but in case some amount remains to be paid on account of interest, same shall also be paid within a period of four weeks, but in that regard, calculations may be made available to the respondents by way of a representation.

3. Consequently, in view of fair stand adopted by learned counsel for the respondents, there appears to be no justification to keep the present proceedings alive and same are disposed of with a direction to the respondents to pay interest component on account of delay in payment of amount of gratuity, within a period of four weeks from today, failing which petitioner would be at liberty to get the instant petition revived so that

appropriate action in accordance with law is taken towards execution/implementation of the order in question. Petitioner is directed to file a detailed representation to the respondents within a week, indicating therein extent of liability upon the respondents on account of interest part, enabling respondents to do the needful well within the stipulated period.

4. Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

October 30, 2020
(Vikrant)