

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No. 202 of 2025

Date of Decision: 28.11.2025

Surjan SinghPetitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & another ... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Ms. Babita Chauhan, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocate Generals and Mr. Ravi Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate 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 03.05.2023 passed by this Court in CWPOA No.205 of 2020, titled **Surjan Singh 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 case of the petitioner in light of judgment dated 12.01.2023 passed by Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.165 of 2021, titled as **State of Himachal Pradesh and others vs. Surajmani and another alongwith connected matters**, expeditiously, preferably

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

within a period of six weeks and in case, petitioner is found to be similarly situate, same benefit shall be granted to him. 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 03.05.2023 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 28, 2025
(shankar)