

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

CWP No.18766 of 1995

Date of Decision:28.02.2017

Haryana Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Technical Staff Association

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present : Mr. R.K. Malik, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Kuldeep Sheoran, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. D.A.G. Haryana.

P.B. BAJANTHRI J. (Oral)

The petitioner-Association's grievance is that not to compel them to render minor veterinary services until supervision and direction of the registered veterinary practitioner are provided to them. Further sought for direction not to take disciplinary action against the members of the petitioner-association.

During pendency of this litigation, Shri S.K. Bhagoria, Deputy Director, Animal Husbandry & Dairying O/o Director General, Animal Husbandry & Dairying, Haryana, Panchkula has filed an affidavit. The relevant extract of which reads as under:

“3. That as per Section 30 (b) of Haryana Veterinary Council Act, 1984 “Minor Veterinary Services” are to be defined and notified by the concerned State Government. In this regard the Government of Haryana had notified the said services on 25.11.1994, wherein none of them was involving the risk of administering Schedule-H Drugs and hence the Veterinary Livestock Development Assistant were free to render these services.

4. That the Government of Haryana, exercising the powers

conferred in the provision of Clause (b) of Section 30 of the Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984 and in supersession of Haryana Government, Animal Husbandry & Dairying, Notification No.50105/CA. 52/1984/5.30/94 dated the 25th November 1994, the State of Haryana again notified “Minor Veterinary Services” on 4.7.2011 wherein S. No.1 requires the prescription of Registered Veterinary Practitioner and rest of these can be freely rendered by the petitioner.”

In view of the above development during pendency of this petition, notification dated 25.11.1994 is superseded. Hence, petition do not survive for consideration.

Accordingly, the petition has become infructuous and the same is disposed of as such.

28.02.2017
rajeev

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether reportable **Yes/No**