

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.6339 of 2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision.04.04.2022

Vineet Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Vs

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vishal Malik, DAG, Haryana.

-. -

JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)

1. Grievance of the petitioners herein, who are Pharmacists and have done their 10+2 from the Board of School and Technical Education, Chhattisgarh ranging from the period from 07.11.2012 to 07.03.2015 is that their qualification is not being accepted now by the respondent-State of Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners would *inter alia* contend that after having done their 10+2 from respondent No.8-Board, they got admission in Punjab/Haryana and acquired the qualification of D Pharmacy/B Pharmacy. On acquiring the said qualification, Pharmacy Council has issued them the necessary licences to set up pharmacies, which have been done. However, now the respondent-State of Haryana is refusing to recognize the basic qualification of 10+2 obtained by them from respondent No.8-Board. It is further contended that as on date, none of the Institutes from where petitioners have obtained their diploma/degree in Pharmacy have raised any objection to their 10+2 certificates. It is also submitted that in a similar situation, the High Court of Rajasthan had gone into the issue and has settled the dispute in favour of the Pharmacists.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that at the moment, petitioners would be satisfied if their grievance is looked into by the respondent-State of Haryana and their licences are renewed as expeditiously as possible.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vishal Malik, DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice for respondents No.1 to 5 and submits that the respondent-State will look into the matter and take a decision in accordance with law. Let sufficient number of copies of the complete paper book be supplied to her during the course of day.

6. Without commenting on merits of the case, I dispose of the instant petition by directing respondent-State of Haryana to treat the writ petition as representation on behalf of the petitioners and take a decision thereon, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, failing which the officer responsible for the lapse would be liable to deposit costs of Rs.20,000/- from his personal pocket with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Advocates Welfare Fund.

7. Till the respondent-State does not take a decision on the said representation, arrest of the petitioners in pursuance to any FIR/complaint submitted against the petitioners qua the dispute as has been raised in the instant petition, shall remain stayed.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

April 04, 2022
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No