



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No.2123 of 2025

Date of Decision: 07.11.2025

Priti Anjana

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.

... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Pranav Kaushal, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General, 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 for implementation and execution of the order/judgment dated 25.07.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No.12005 of 2025, titled as ***Priti Anjana Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.***

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

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



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. Vishal Panwar, 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 orders, sought to be executed, must have been complied with, but if not, same would be complied with within a period of six 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 six 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.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 07, 2025
(sunil)