

ANAHITA HANDA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND
OTHERS

PRESENT Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr. Suryaveer S. Surjewala, Advocate,
Mr. Amandeep S. Talwar, Advocate, and
Mr. Abhijeet Rawaley, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioners, inter alia, contends that the impugned order dated 21.12.2022 (Annexure P-1) issued by the respondents-State of Haryana, does not refer to any statutory provision in exercise whereof such a declaration has been issued. In the absence of invocation of any such substantive power, enforcement of restraint against the petitioners from carrying on their business/occupation, is violative of the rights granted to them. He further contends that the petitioners were duly issued their licences by the competent-Authority to deal in the sale and purchase of meat and meat products in the said area and that they undertake to carry out business as per law.

Notice of motion.

Notice re: stay as well.

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and 5. Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G. Haryana, who by virtue of his assignment would thus also be on the panel of all the statutory Boards and corporations of the State of Haryana, is requested to and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.4-Municipal Corporation, Panchkula. They pray for some time to complete instructions.

List on 07.08.2023.

In the meanwhile, operation of the impugned Notification dated 21.12.2022 (Annexure P-1) shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.

April 17, 2023.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE