IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No.2009 of 2026
Date of Decision: 13.10.2026

Minesh Thakur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

.....Respondents

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vinay Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol & Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General and Mr. Ravi Chauhan & Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocates General.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Pursuant to order dated 11.09.2026, Mr. Abhishek, Superintendent of Police, Kullu, has come present. He has placed on record instructions dated 12.10.2026 issued under the signature of Director General of Police, perusal whereof reveals that pursuant to directions contained in the judgment sought to be executed, clarification was sought from the Department of Personnel, which vide communication dated 07.04.2026 apprised the Department of Police that vide instructions dated 12.11.2025, game of Wushu has been included in the list of games and sports which qualify meritorious sports persons for consideration for appointment or engagement to Group A, B, C and D posts/ services under

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 04/11/2026 11:47:16 :::CIS

the State Government, but such instructions are prospective, as a result thereof, in the selection process which stands concluded prior to issuance of aforesaid notification, benefit of aforesaid notification cannot be extended.

2. Having carefully perused the aforesaid communication as well as documents annexed therewith, this Court finds merit in the submission of learned Additional Advocate General, however, vide judgment sought to be executed, this Court had directed the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner for appointment against the post of Constable under sports quota pursuant to communication dated 15.01.2025, but till date no consideration order has been passed.

3. Learned Additional Advocate General undertakes to comply with the direction of this Court within a period of four weeks.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, nothing remains to be adjudicated in the instant petition and as such, the same is disposed of with direction to the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner in terms of judgment sought to be executed within a period of four weeks, failing which the petitioner would be at liberty to get the present petition revived enabling this Court to pass appropriate orders.

October 13, 2026 **(Sandeep Sharma),**
(manjit) **Judge**

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 04/11/2026 11:47:16 :::CIS