Anand WArdhan and Anr. v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Anr.

CMP No. 27140 of 2026 in Execution Petition No. 1917 of 2025

05.11.2026 Present: Mr. Surinder Prakash Sharma, Advocate, for the applicant/petitioner.
Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the non-applicants/respondents.

While placing on record communication dated 03.11.2026 issued under the signature of Director, School Education, Mr. Ravi Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General states that since Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP (Civil) Diary No. 32886/2025 titled State of Himachal Pradesh vs. Narayan Dutt Sharma has passed interim direction dated 12.11.2024, thereby staying the order of High Court regarding annual increment of contractual period, mandate contained in the judgment sought to be executed cannot be complied with, there appears to be merit in the contention of learned Deputy Advocate General and as such, present application is disposed of at this stage, reserving liberty to applicant/petitioner to file fresh at appropriate time, if required.

November 05, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
manjit **Judge**

Naresh Kumar and Anr v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

Execution Petition No. 2499 of 2026

05.11.2026 Present: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.
Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

While placing on record communication dated 04.11.2026 issued under the signature of Director, Urban Development, Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, states that mandate contained in the judgment sought to be executed could not be complied with for the reason that respondent-State has filed LPA against the judgment sought to be executed.

Though careful perusal of aforesaid communication, which is taken on record, substantiates the aforesaid statement of learned Additional Advocate General, but definitely cannot be a ground to adjourn the case sine die. Needless to say, mere filing of LPA, if any, may not be sufficient. Till the time, judgment sought to be executed is stayed, modified or altered, respondent Department is under legal obligation to implement the same in its letter and spirit.

Though having taken note of the fact that judgment sought to be executed was passed one and a half year back, there appears to be no justification to grant further time, but by way of indulgence and as a last opportunity, three weeks' time is granted to respondents to comply with the mandate contained the judgment sought to be executed, failing which this Court shall have no option, but to pass order of attachment of the account of department as well as salary of the erring officials.

List on **10.12.2026**.

November 05, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
manjit **Judge**

Ashok Kumar v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

Execution Petition No. 2492 of 2026

05.11.2026 Present: Mr.Vinod Kumar, Advocate vice Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajan Kahol, Additional Advocate General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General, for the State.

Further three weeks' time, as prayed for, is grnated to the respondents to comply with judgment sought to be executed. List on 9.12.2026.

November 05, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
manjit **Judge**