IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Execution Petition No.2089 of 2026
Date of Decision: 17.09.2026

Veena Rani & Anr.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors.

... Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the Petitioners: Mr. Yogesh Kumar Chandel, Advocate.

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

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

By way of instant Execution Petition, prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioners for issuance of directions to the respondents for implementation and execution of the order/judgment dated 12.05.2026 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.5980 of 2026, titled as ***Veena Rani and another Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others.***

2. Careful perusal of aforesaid order/judgment, sought to be executed in the present proceedings, reveals that Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, while disposing of the writ petition filed by the petitioners, directed

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

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 08:32:31 :::CIS

that representation made by the petitioners shall be decided by the competent authority in the light of averments made therein within twelve weeks by passing a speaking order in accordance with law. Since, despite there being specific direction to do the needful, as taken note herein above, respondents failed to comply with the judgment, petitioners have 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 orders, sought to be executed, 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 afore undertaking given 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 direction to the respondents to do the needful, positively within a period of three weeks from today, if not already done, failing which, petitioners 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.

List for compliance on 02.11.2026.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

September 17, 2026
(sunil)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 08:32:31 :::CIS