



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

**CWP-23149-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 29.04.2026**

PUNJAB STATE VETERINARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

....Petitioner

vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Birinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Ishan Kaushal, AAG, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to implement Section 30 of the Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984 (for short "1984 Act") in letter and spirit.

2. On 12.09.2015, the following order was passed:-

" In affidavit dated 09.04.2025 filed by the Director, Department of Animal Husbandry, Punjab, it has been inter-alia deposed as under:-

"3. That it is humbly submitted that the since the filing of the last reply illustrating the position of Veterinary Officers in the State of Punjab, the situation has further improved



with subsequent recruitment process. At present the total sanctioned cadre post of Veterinary Officer is 1508 and at present 969 posts are already filled and Officers are working at their designated places in compliance of Section 30 of the Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984. It is befitting to mention here that at present a fresh recruitment process is undergoing for the recruitment of 405 more Veterinary Officer. The posts were advertised in 2024 and now, examination process is complete and shortly 405 more Veterinary Officers will join to fulfil the legislative intent of the Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984. For the perusal of this Hon'ble Court a copy of the advertisement is appended herewith as ANNEXURE R-1/2.”

Upon instructions received from Mr. Sanjay Jhahria, Senior Assistant, Legal Cell, Department of Animal Husbandry, Punjab, State counsel submits that the result for the advertised post is likely to be announced within the next fortnight. He requests for deferment to file a fresh status report.

List on 15.12.2025.”

3. The aforesaid order was followed by order dated 21.01.2025 which reads as:-

“ This is the second round of litigation. Earlier, the petitioner has approached this Court, by filing CWP No.18911 of 2011, for issuance of directions upon the State of Punjab, to adhere to the provisions of Section 30 of the Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984 (for short ‘the Act of 1984’). The said



petition was disposed of vide order dated 27.10.2017, with a positive mandamus upon the respondent No.1-State of Punjab, to take a decision, at the earliest, in view of the provisions of Section 30 of the Act of 1984.

In order to give effect to proviso of Section 30 of the ibid Act, while passing the impugned order, the Veterinary Inspector and Class-IV employees, working in various veterinary dispensaries were ordered to be put under the supervision of Veterinary Surgeon/Officer. Though, on papers, it seems to have made the compliance of provisions of Section 30 of the Act of 1984, but this decision has created a cascading effect, that a veterinary doctor/officer, has to supervise about 9 to 10 dispensaries, which are located in different places in that district, which is not possible to a person to comply with.

For example, one Dr. Shikha Rani, CVH Budlada, has also been given the additional charge of CVH Bachoana. The distance amongst each dispensaries is also calculated by the petitioner, which is also extracted hereinafter :-

“1. District Mansa

<i>CVH Budlada (09 Cvd attached)</i>	<i>additional charge</i>	<i>CVH Bachoana (No Cvd Attached)</i>
<i>9.4 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Kulheri</i>	<i>15 Km</i>
<i>4.5 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Ahmedpur</i>	<i>12 Km</i>
<i>5.1 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Chakk Bhaike</i>	<i>4.6 Km</i>
<i>6.9 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Gurne Kalan</i>	<i>11 Km</i>
<i>6.7 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Hasanpur</i>	<i>7.1 Km</i>
<i>9.8 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Dodra</i>	<i>2.9 Km</i>
<i>14 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Garhdi</i>	<i>7.2 Km</i>
<i>11.9 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Tahlia</i>	<i>20 Km</i>
<i>17.2 Km</i>	<i>Cvd Akanwali</i>	<i>25 Km</i>
<i>Cvd Gurne Kalan</i>	<i>to Akanwali</i>	<i>21.6 Km</i>
<i>Cvd Dodra</i>	<i>to Akanwali</i>	<i>28 Km</i>



Cvd Ahmedput to Akanwali 14.6 Km”

Therefore, the impugned order is completely ineffective; rather, it defeats the very objective of Section 30 of the Act of 1984. Not only this, the respondent No.3, Punjab State Veterinary Council, has also supported the cause, as raised by the petitioner. It is informed to this Court, by way of short reply dated 23.06.2020, that the Council has passed a resolution dated 22.12.1994, regarding opening of veterinary hospitals only in future in the State of Punjab; resolution dated 29.07.1998, regarding dispensaries should be manned by Veterinary Graduates; and also on 08.03.2018, earlier resolution was passed regarding implementation of Section 30 of the Indian Veterinary Council Act, 1984.

When all these facts were confronted to learned State counsel, he, informs this Court, that the instant petition is pending since 2018, and now, the situation has improved in the State of Punjab, as more number of veterinary doctors/officers, have been recruited/appointed.

Let fresh affidavit, be filed by the respondents No.1 and 2, disclosing therein, as to how the State of Punjab, is making compliance of Section 30 of the Act of 1984, as on date, and whether, still dispensaries are given under the supervision of veterinary doctors, who is appointed in veterinary hospitals.

Adjourned to 09.04.2025.

The affidavit shall positively be filed on or before the next date of hearing. In the eventuality of non-compliance of the direction (supra), the respondent No.2, shall cause personal appearance, before this Court.”

4. The respondent by way of supplementary reply/affidavit has placed on record order of posting of Veterinary Officers. As per said order, the respondent has appointed 281 Veterinary Officers in different Civil Veterinary hospitals of the State of Punjab.



5. In the wake of afore-stated affidavit, the petition stands disposed of. The petitioner is at liberty to avail other remedies as permissible by law, if cause survives.
6. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

29.04.2026
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No