IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No.1920 of 2025
Date of Decision: 28.10.2025

Rakesh Chand .....**Petitioner**

Versus

State of H.P. and Others .....**Respondents**

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Pranav Kaushal, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General, with Mr. Ravi Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, for State.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of instant execution petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for execution and implementation of judgment dated 02.07.2025, passed by this Court in CWP No.10509 of 2025, whereby this Court passed the following order:

> "3. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the pending representation (Annexure P-5) of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of six weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass detailed speaking order thereupon taking note of the judgment rendered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in Mohit Sharma case (supra), wherein issue otherwise sought to be decided in the instant proceedings already stands adjudicated. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings in appropriate Court of law, if he still remains aggrieved."

2. Since no action, whatsoever, came to be taken at the behest of the respondents pursuant to aforesaid direction, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting in appearance on behalf of the respondents, states that though he has every reason to presume and believe that by now, order/judgment sought to be executed, must have been complied with in its totality, but if not, same would be definitely complied with within a period of three weeks from today.

4. Consequently, in view of 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 sought to be executed, 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 towards the implementation of the order/judgment.

October 28, 2025 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(Rajeev Raturi) **Judge**