IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No. 2389 of 2026

Date of Decision: 05.10.2026

Vinod Kumar .…….Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & another … Respondents

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Ashok Kumar Verma, Advocate.

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

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 to implement/ execute the order/judgment dated 15.09.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No. 14851 of 2025, titled **Vinod Kumar vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others.**

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid order/judgment, sought to be executed in the instant proceedings, reveals that this Court, while disposing of the petition, directed the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner in light of judgment dated 21.03.2024 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.2056 of 2023, titled **Ghanshyam Dass and others vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others** and judgment dated 07.04.2025 passed in CWP No. 4830 of 2023 titled **Inder Singh Thakur and**

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

others vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others alongwith connected matter, within a period of six weeks**.** Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note hereinabove, respondents have failed to do so, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, 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 judgment/ order 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 fair statement made 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 in terms of order/judgment dated 15.09.2025 passed by this Court, 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

October 05,2026
(shankar)