

**BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL  
AT DEHRADUN**

**EXECUTION PETITION NO. 05/DB/2011**

*(Arising out of judgment dated 07.01.1994,  
passed in Claim petition No. 102/F/IV/1993)*

Sri Devendra Kumar Saxena, s/o late Sri Radhey Prasad Saxena, aged about 70 years, r/o Lane No.-5, Vikas Lok, Sahastradhara Road, Dehradun.

**....Petitioner /applicant**

**vs.**

1. U.P. Poser Corporation Ltd. through its Managing Director, 14 Ashok Mark, Shakti Bhawan, Lucknow, U.P.
2. Director, Finance, UPPCL, Lucknow, 14 Ashok Mark, Shakti Bhawan, Lucknow, U.P.
3. Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd. through its Managing Director, Urja Bhawan, Dehradun.
4. Uttarakhand Jal Vidyut Nigam through its Managing Director, Maharani Bagh, GMS Road, Dehradun.

**....Respondents**

Present: There is no representation for the petitioner/applicant.  
Sri V.P.Devrani, A.P.O., for the State Respondents.

**JUDGMENT**

**DATED: JANUARY 22, 2026**

**Justice U.C.Dhyani (Oral)**

On 28.08.2025, Sri Abhishek Pant, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner/applicant had submitted that the petitioner has passed away, therefore, his legal representative will move substitution application.

2. No substitution application has been filed till date.
3. The order of the Tribunal has been complied with. Details of the compliance have been mentioned in Tribunal's order dated 27.01.2025.

4. The Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd. had released a sum of Rs.50 lacs after deducting applicable tax amount vide Cheque No. 029720 dated 24.01.2025 in the account of the petitioner/applicant.

5. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner/applicant had agreed, on such date, that the aforesaid money has been credited to the account of the petitioner.

6. The execution application would have been closed on that date itself, but for the fact that Ld. Counsel for the petitioner staked claim for more money. So far nothing has been brought on record to show that the petitioner is entitled to more amount than what has already been credited to his account.

5. The Tribunal is not entering into further details of the accounting. Only three things are worth mentioning: (i) the money has been paid to the petitioner, (ii) there is nothing on record to show that he is entitled to more money and (iii) no legal representative has been substituted in place of the petitioner (since deceased) within time, therefore, the execution application should abate.

6. The application for setting aside the abatement order may be moved on behalf of the petitioner, in due course, if the same is found tenable in law and if the legal representatives of the petitioner are so advised.

7. Resultantly, the execution application is closed.

**(ARUN SINGH RAWAT)**  
VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

**(JUSTICE U.C.DHYANI)**  
CHAIRMAN

*DATE: JANUARY 2, 2026.  
DEHRADUN*

VM