

---

**(2020) 09 SHI CK 0448**  
**In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh**  
**Case No : Execution Petition No. 405 Of 2020**

Savita Chauhan

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of HP And Anr.

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 29-09-2020

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation :** (2020) 09 SHI CK 0448

**Hon'ble Judges :** Sandeep Sharma, J

**Bench :** Single Bench

**Advocate :** Sunil Kumar, Ashok Sharma, Sudhir Bhatnagar, Arvind Sharma

**Final Decision :** Disposed Of

---

## Judgement

Sandeep Sharma, J

1. By way of present execution petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioners for implementation and execution of order/judgment dated 14.5.2018, passed by the Erstwhile HP State Administrative Tribunal in OA No. 2451 of 2018, whereby the Tribunal below having taken note of the statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that her case is squarely covered by the judgment dated 21.4.2010 passed in CWP(T) No. 5228 of 2008, Prem Lal Sharma v. State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors, as upheld vide judgment dated 1.9.2015 in LPA No. 146 of 2010, State of HP and Ors v. Narian Singh and connected matters, passed by this Court, directed the respondents to consider the case of the applicant strictly in light of aforesaid judgment and grant similar benefit to her, if she is found similarly situate within a period of three months from the date of production of certified copy of the order. Since no action, whatsoever, came to be taken at the behest of the respondents pursuant to aforesaid direction issued by the Tribunal, petitioners have approached this Court in the instant proceedings.

2. Mr. Arvind Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General states that though he has every reason to presume that by now, order/judgment alleged to have been

not implemented, must have been complied with in its totality, but if not, same would be definitely complied with within a period of three weeks.

3. Consequently, in view of the fair stand adopted by the learned counsel for the respondents, this Court sees no reason to keep present petition alive and accordingly, same is disposed of with direction to the respondents to do the needful in terms of judgment alleged to have been violated within a period of three weeks, failing which petitioner would be at liberty to get the present petition revived so that appropriate action towards implementation of the judgment alleged to have been not implemented is taken.