

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 23/12/2025

(2025) 12 SHI CK 0026 Himachal Pradesh HC

Case No: Execution Petition No.2394 Of 2025

Ravinder Kumar APPELLANT

۷s

State Of Himachal Pradesh & Anr RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 2, 2025

Hon'ble Judges: Sandeep Sharma, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Vaibhav Tanwar, Rajan Kahol, Vishal Panwar, Ravi Chauhan

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

Sandeep Sharma, J

- 1. By way f 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 23.06.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No.5424 of 2025, titled as Ravinder Kumar 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 allowing the writ petition filed by the petitioner, directed the respondents to give appointment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds from the date of his initial appointment shall be deemed to have been given on regular basis. Further in terms of law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in Lekh Ram's case and in CWP No. 7556 of 2022, titled Rahul Attri and another vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others, and CWPOA No. 2343 of 2020 titled Vikram Singh Vs Himachal Road Transport Corporation along with connected matters, petitioner shall be entitled to all consequential benefits. 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 C urt 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 reas n 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 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.