



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

Execution Petition(T) No. 76 of 2021

Decided on: July 8, 2021

Pushpa Devi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and others ...Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting¹?

For the petitioner: Mr. A.K. Gupta, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Sudhir Bhatnagar and Mr. Arvind Sharma, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Kunal Thakur, Deputy Advocate General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. (Oral)

By way of instant petition filed under Rule 16 of Himachal Pradesh High Court Original Writ Rules, 1997, prayer has been made for implementation of order dated 27.3.2018 passed by erstwhile Himachal Pradesh Administrative Tribunal in OA(D) No. 15 of 2018, titled Pushpa Devi vs. The State of H.P. and others, whereby learned Tribunal, on the basis of statement made by learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner that the case of petitioner is covered by judgment dated 8.3.2018 rendered by Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 6309 of 2017, **Sunder Singh vs. the State of Himachal Pradesh and others** and connected matters, disposed of the Original

Whether reporters of the Local papers are allowed to see the judgment? .

Application with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for grant of pension in light of order (supra), within three months from the date of production of a certified copy of the order. Since the respondents have failed to implement the order of the Himachal Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings, seeking implementation of the order passed by Himachal Pradesh Administrative Tribunal.

2. Mr. Arvind Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, while accepting notices on behalf of the respondents, stated that though he has reasons to believe that the order in question stands implemented, but if not, same would be complied with, within a period of two weeks.

3. Consequently, in view of the fair stand taken by learned Additional Advocate General, this Court sees no reason to keep the present petition alive and same is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to do the needful in terms of order (supra), within two weeks, failing which petitioner would be at liberty to get the present petition revived, so that appropriate steps towards execution of the order in question are taken. Petition stands disposed of in above terms.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

July 8, 2021
(Vikrant)