

(2025) 11 SHI CK 0005

Himachal Pradesh HC

Case No: Execution Petition No. 2144 Of 2025

Yogesh Sharma

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Himachal
Pradesh & Anr

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Nov. 10, 2025

Hon'ble Judges: Sandeep Sharma, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Dhanvanti, Anuja Mehta, Anup Rattan, Rajan Kahol, Vishal Panwar, Ravi
Chauhan, Anish Banshtu

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

Sandeep Sharma, J

1. y way of instant Execution Petition, prayer has been made on be alf of the petitioner for issuance of directions to the respondents for implementation and execution of the order/judgment dated 28.07.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No.12097 of 2025, titled as Yogesh Sharma Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr.

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 and decide the representation of the petitioner (Annexure P-4) in light of judgment passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No. 1638 of 2024 titled as Mohit Sharma& Anr. Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. within six weeks. 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. Rajan Kahol, lea ned 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, s ught 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 from today, 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.