IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

Execution Petition(T) No. 430 of 2020
Decided on: November 9, 2020

Subhash Chand ...**Petitioner**

Versus

The Himachal Pradesh Tourism Development Corporation Ltd. 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.

THROUGH VIDEO-CONFERENCING

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of instant petition filed under Rule 16(1) of HP High Court Original Side Rules, 1997, prayer has been made for the execution of order dated 24.4.2019 passed by erstwhile Himachal Pradesh Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 1644 of 2019 titled Subhash Chand vs. The Himachal Pradesh Tourism Development Corporation Limited and another, whereby learned Tribunal, having taken note of the statement made by 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

---

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

the petitioner within two months from the date of production of a certified copy of order, subject to his being similarly situate person. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner fairly states that after filing of the execution at hand, a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- stand paid to the petitioner in terms of order sought to be executed in the instant proceedings, but still a sum of Rs.4,00,676/- is due but since despite repeated requests, nothing has been done, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

2. Mr. Naresh Kaul, learned Counsel appearing for the respondents, states that though he has every reason to believe that the order in question stands implemented, but if not, same would be complied with, within a period of six weeks.

3. Consequently, in view of the fair stand taken by learned counsel for the respondents, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive and same is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to do the needful in terms of order in question, within six weeks, failing which petitioner would be at liberty to get the present petition revived, so that appropriate steps towards execution of the order in question are taken. Petition stands disposed of in above terms.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

November 9, 2020
(Vikrant)