



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

114+247 (2 cases)

CWP-18466-2025

Date of Decision: 23.03.2026

Maaya Gaming and Technologies Private Limited**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****...Respondents****And****CWP-6891-2026****M/s City Soul Hospitality LLP and another****...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. Karambir Singh Nalwa, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vijiyesh Malhotra, Advocate and
Ms. Ashima Attri, Advocate, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CWP No.18466 of 2025)

Mr. Aman Pal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Rohit Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Rishabh Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CWP No.6891 of 2026)

Mr. Deepak Vashisht, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from *CWP No.18466 of 2025*.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227

of the Constitution of India is seeking directions to respondents to issue 'No



Objection Certificate’ for conducting games of skill such as poker and rummy. It is further seeking directions to respondents not to interfere in its activities relating to games namely poker and rummy.

3. The petitioner is engaged in the business of gaming. It claims that poker and rummy games should be excluded from the purview of Haryana Prevention of Public Gambling Act, 2025 (for short ‘**Gambling Act**’). Karnataka High Court in ***Tilt Room Recreation Society v. State of Karnataka and others, Writ Petition No.55798/2017 (GM-Police)*** has already allowed writ petition filed by Tilt Room Poker Club. The petitioner has filed representations with respondents seeking ‘*No Objection Certificate*’ for conducting games of skill such as poker and rummy.

4. On 07.07.2025, this Court passed the following order:

“The representation of the petitioner was not decided by the respondents, which has caused the grievance to the petitioner, propelling him to file the instant writ petition, cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of mandamus, upon the respondents, to decide his representation, in a time bound manner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner wishes to run his Poker Club. However, he has an apprehension that the local administration, would create an unnecessary hindrance, in operating of the said Club, assuming the games of Poker and Rummy, as gambling. He further submits that Poker and Rummy, does not fall within the ambits of The Haryana Prevention of Public Gambling Act, 2025, rather these are the games of skill.

This Court has put a specific query to learned counsel for the petitioner, as to whether, the respondent State, has notified, that Poker and Rummy, are the games of skill, as defined under Section 2(g) of The Haryana Prevention of Public Gambling Act, 2025, to which he answered that he is



not aware about any such notification, and seeks an adjournment to apprise this Court, in this regard.

The asked for request is accepted.

List this matter on 06.11.2025, for arguments.

5. The aforesaid order was followed by order dated 13.01.2026 which reads as:

“Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has invited the attention of the Court to communication dated 13.10.2025, Annexure R-1, addressed by the Additional Chief Secretary to Government Haryana to the Commissioner of Police, Gurugram. The relevant extract of the communication is reproduced hereunder:

“2. In this regard, it is informed that Government has not issued any notification under Section 2(1)(g) of the Haryana Prevention of Public Gambling Act, 2025 till date for exempting any game from the purview of the Act being "Game of Skill". Further, it is intimated that vide letter dated 28.05.2025, the Director General of Police, Haryana has been requested to send proposal to the government citing the names/categories of games which may be notified as "Games of Skill" under Section 2(1)(g) of the Haryana Prevention of Public Gambling Act, 2025 for the purpose of exempting them from the purview of the Act. The proposal/report in this regard is still awaited.

*Sd/-
Superintendent, Home Confidential
for Additional Chief Secretary to Government Haryana,
Home Department.”*

State counsel has been confronted with the communication and he requests for deferment to file an additional affidavit.

List on 23.03.2026.”

6. Written Statement filed by respondent No.4 in CWP No.6891 of 2026 is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

7. As per reply filed by respondent-State, Union of India has



‘2025 Act’). As per Section 2(1)(g) of 2025 Act, ‘*online money game*’ means an online game irrespective of whether such game is based on skill, chance or both, played by a user by paying fees. The game offered by petitioner falls within the definition of ‘*online money game*’, thus, the petitioner cannot conduct online money games such as poker and rummy.

8. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent in its reply has pointed out that activities of the petitioner are governed by 2025 Act. From the preamble as well as provisions of the aforesaid Act, it is evident that petitioner is not governed by said Act because it is not carrying out online gaming activities. The petitioner is carrying out only physical gaming activities. The respondent initially tried to cover petitioner’s activity in Gambling Act and now is trying to bring it under 2025 Act. The police officials have been visiting its premises and threatening to initiate criminal/penal proceedings. In such an atmosphere, it is impossible for it to carry out business activities. It amounts to violation of fundamental right of business and trade as guaranteed by Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India.

9. Learned State counsel expressed his inability to controvert that 2025 Act is applicable to online gaming. If the petitioner carries out online gaming activities, it would be covered. Physical activities are not covered by 2025 Act.

10. On being asked, learned State counsel submits that no coercive step shall be taken against the petitioner without issuing notice and proceeding, if any, would be initiated in accordance with procedure prescribed under Gambling Act.

12. From the pleadings and arguments of petitioner, it appears that it is attempting to seek advance ruling. The concept of advance is contemplated under different enactments especially taxing statutes. In the Acts in hand, there is no provision for advance ruling, thus, in the absence of action taken by respondents, there is no question to express opinion. The Court is sanguine that respondents would not take any coercive step without following procedure prescribed under aforesaid Acts. The respondent besides provisions of Gambling Act would keep in mind principle of natural justice before taking any coercive step.

13. In *CWP No.6891 of 2026*, the respondent has already issued notice. The respondent would pass an appropriate order after granting opportunity of hearing. The petitioner would be at liberty to point out that its activities are not covered by Gambling Act. The respondent would proceed further if it finds that petitioner’s activities are actually covered by 2025 Act and Gambling Act. The Authorities would keep in mind observations made hereinabove. The Authorities would take an appropriate decision within six weeks from the date of filing reply to notice dated 13.02.2026 (Annexure P-6). Earlier decision, if any taken, would not be brought into force till the passing of fresh order.

14. The petitions stand disposed of in above terms.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

23.03.2026
Mohit Kumar

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