

Sr. No.119

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No. 26372 of 2016
Date of decision:22.12.2016**

Suraj Diagnostic and Research Centre

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CWP No. 26373 of 2016

Privat Hospitals

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CWP No. 26374 of 2016

Jain Hospital

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CWP No. 26375 of 2016

Haryana X-ray and Ultrasound Center

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

**Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.**

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.(Oral)

This order shall dispose of four petitions bearing CWP Nos.

26372 to 26375 of 2016. However, the facts are being extracted from CWP No. 26372 of 2016.

Shorn of the unnecessary details, the petitioner is running a Diagnostic and Research Centre at Gurgaon(for short, 'the centre'). Admittedly, the centre was registered from 30.09.2011 to 30.09.2016 for a period of five years and the renewal of the registration was due 30 days before the expiry of the registration. The petitioner applied for renewal of registration on 1.12.2016 and the said application is still stated to be pending. However, on 6.12.2016, raid was conducted and found that the petitioner had done some business in the month of October and November, 2016 despite the fact that it had no registration during that period. Consequently, the seizure memo was prepared and both the ultra sound machines were sealed.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though the petitioner had delayed in applying for renewal as it is required under the statute to apply for it before 30 days of its expiry but has relied upon a decision of this Court rendered in the case of *Sikka Clinic vs. State of Haryana and another*, CWP No. 10136 of 2013 decided on 10.05.2013 in which liberty has been given to make an application for fresh registration, if permissible under law. Counsel for the petitioner prays that it may also be permitted to file an application for securing fresh registration and in case, such an application is filed that may be ordered to be decided by the respondent as early as possible preferably within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of application, in accordance with law after passing speaking order.

The prayer made by counsel for the petitioner is found to be totally innocuous and supported by the order passed by this Court in the case of Sikka clinic(supra), therefore, the present petitions are hereby *disposed of*, relegating the petitioner to its remedy to file an application for seeking fresh registration. In case, any such application is filed for the purpose of seeking fresh registration, pursuant to this order, the same shall be entertained by the respondent and decided within a period of two weeks from the date of its receipt after associating the petitioner. It is needless to mention that the order has to be reasoned and speaking.

22nd December, 2016

Shivani Kaushik

**[Rakesh Kumar Jain]
Judge**

Whether Speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No