IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No.933 of 2025
Date of Decision: 22.07.2025

Savita Bibi .…….Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. … Respondents

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

For the Petitioners: Mr. Suneel Awasthi, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Vishal Panwar & Mr. B.C. Verma, Additional Advocate Generals with Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, for the respondent-State.

Mr. Dheeraj K.Vashisht, Advocate, for respondents No. 2 & 3.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant Execution Petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for issuance of directions to the respondents for implementation and execution of the order/judgment dated 11.03.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No.8761 of 2022, titled as ***Smt. Savita Bibi Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.***

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid order/judgment, sought to be executed in the present proceedings, reveals that this Court, while disposing of the writ petition filed by the petitioner, directed the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner afresh in terms of policy in vogue at the time of death of husband of the petitioner.

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

Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note herein above, respondents failed to comply with the judgment, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Vishal Panwar, 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 orders, sought to be executed, 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 afore undertaking given 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, positively within a period of three weeks, if not already done, failing which, petitioner 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

July 22, 2025
(sunil)