

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**Execution Petition No. 2119 of 2025**

**Date of Decision: 06.11.2025**

---

Smt. Sudha Mehta .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & others ... Respondents

---

Coram:

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.**

Whether approved for reporting? <sup>1</sup>

---

**For the Petitioner:** Mr. M.A.Safee, Advocate.

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

---

**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 30.07.2025 passed by this Court in CWP No. 12371 of 2025, titled **Sudha Mehta 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 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No. 1638 of 2024, titled **Mohit Sharma and another vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others**, within a period of six weeks. Since, despite there being

---

<sup>1</sup>Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

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 30.07.2025 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**

November 06, 2025  
(shankar)