

201

.Vs..

DATE OF THE ORDER

ORDER

W.P. 15800 of 2012 W.P. No.11606 of 2014

3.2.2016

Shri Suyash Thakur, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Amit Seth, G.A., for the respondents State.

Shri Ishan Mehta, Advocate for the Municipal Council.

Shri Darshan Soni, Advocate for the respondent No.4 in W.P. No.11606/2014.

W.P. No.15800 of 2012:

Heard counsel for the parties on admission.

This petition has been filed essentially taking clue from the direction issued by this Court in W.P. No.15787/2005 on 30.1.2008 and which has been followed in subsequent decision rendered on 14.3.2011 in W.P.No.14778/2010. At the same time, it is noticed that the petitioner has already made representations to several Authorities including the Chief Municipal Officer of concerned Municipal Council (Annexure-P/6).

We have also noticed that the respondent No.4 Municipal Council, in response filed in the present proceedings, has mentioned that the Municipal Council is taking steps for notifying places for slaughter of the animals u/s 264 and also for issuing license u/s 261 of the Act of

Vs.....

DATE OF THE ORDER

COLDEN AUGUSTE TEAR MAR

ORDER

---2---

1961. Besides, assurance is also given that no unauthorized or illegal activities will be countenanced in the Municipal Council area, as is predicated in the two decisions already rendered by this Court referred to above.

On accepting this assurance given on behalf of the respondent No.4, we dispose of this petition with a hope that prompt response will be given by the respondent No.4 and its officers to any fresh complaint to be received in respect of the subject matter of this petition.

W.P. No.11606/2014:

This petition is also disposed of on the same terms as above.


sell -

(A.M. Khanwilkar) Chief Justice (Sanjay Yadav)
Judge

Khan*

Mich Court of Madaga Frades

	ORDER SHEET	
MALEUE TEN ME	CASE No201	
100	Vs	
T. Control of the con	2	
DATE OF THE ORDER	ORDER	
	1961. Besides, assurance is also g	iven that no unauthorize
	or illegal activities will be countenanced in the Municipa	
	Council area, as is predicated in the two decisions already	
	rendered by this Court referred to above.	
ga, ja	On accepting this assurance given on behalf or	
And the second s	respondent No.4, we dispose of this petition with a hope	
and a supply in good manager.	hat prompt response will be given by the respondent No.4	
	and its officers to any fresh complaint to be received in	
1	respect of the subject matter of this petition.	
	W.P. No.11606/2014 :	
	This petition is also disposed of on the same terms a	
	above.	
		A.4
	(A.M. Khanwilkar)	(Sanjay Yadav)
	Chief Justice	Judge
Khan*	T	RUE GOLY
		Lordon
	Migh C	ours of Harry Pradent
		and the second s



HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH ORDER SHEET ASE No.....201......201 --- |---ORDER DATE OF THE ORDER W.P. 15800 of 2012 W.P. No.11606 of 2014 3.2.2016 Shri Suyash Thakur, Advocate for the petitioners. Shri Amit Seth, G.A., for the respondents State. Shri Ishan Mehta, Advocate for the Municipal Council.

Shri Darshan Soni, Advocate for the respondent No.4 in W.P. No.11606/2014.

W.P. No.15800 of 2012:

Heard counsel for the parties on admission.

This petition has been filed essentially taking clue from the direction issued by this Court in W.P. No.15787/2005 on 30.1.2008 and which has been followed subsequent decision rendered on 14.3.2011 W.P.No.14778/2010. At the same time, it is noticed that the petitioner has already made representations to several Authorities including the Chief Municipal Officer of concerned Municipal Council (Annexure-P/6).

We have also noticed that the respondent No.4 Municipal Council, in response filed in the present proceedings, has mentioned that the Municipal Concil is taking steps for notifying places for slaughter of the animals u/s 264 and also for issuing license u/s 261 of the Act of