



CWP-716-2012 1

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

(208)

CWP-716-2012

Date of Decision : September 09, 2024

Durlabh Singh

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Jain, Legal Aid Counsel, with
Mr. Akshat Dalal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that certain Veterinary Pharmacist, who are working, are not eligible keeping in view the provisions of Section 30 (b) of Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984 but they are being given extension.

2. On being asked as to which of the Veterinary Pharmacist are ineligible and whether they have been impleaded as a party to the present petition, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no such details of the Veterinary Pharmacist, who are ineligible and have been allowed to continue, have been given.

3. From the facts stated hereinbefore, in case the prayer of the petitioner is accepted, certain Veterinary Pharmacists will lose their job. No order can be passed against an employee, who is not party to the petition.



CWP-716-2012 **2**

4. Keeping in view the above, the present writ petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner that in case the petitioner has any grievance against any of the Veterinary Pharmacist, who is not eligible, the petitioner can file appropriate petition by impleading all the concerned, who are likely to be affected.

September 09, 2024

harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No