
(2012) 02 UK CK 0047

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Writ Petition (MS) No. 199 of 2012

Natural Electro Homeopathy Research and Development
Society

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Uttarakhand and others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 06-02-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2012) 02 UK CK 0047

Hon'ble Judges : Umesh Chandra Dhyani, J

Bench : Single Bench

Judgement

Hon'ble U.C. Dhyani, J.—Heard.

2. The writ petition is being decided finally with the consent of parties.

3. Petitioner seeks to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to cooperate with the petitioner and his society, in the development, practice and promotion of "Natural Electro Homeopathy" and further direct the respondent No. 2 to decide the fresh representation made by the petitioner.

4. The petitioner has stated in Paragraph 11 of the petition that no objection from the administration and police has been obtained. The petitioner society submitted an application to the office of the Chief Medical Officer, Udham Singh Nagar on 19.12.2011. The office of Chief Medical Officer refused to take on record the letter dated 19.12.2011 and therefore, the petitioner was forced to send its application to the office of Chief Medical Officer, Udham Singh Nagar via registered post. The medical camp was to be set up from 25.12.2011 to 1.1.2012, but in the absence of reply to the letter dated 19.12.2011, the free medical camp of the petitioner society could not be materialized. No objection/ consent of the Chief Medical Officer is a prerequisite for organizing a medical camp. It has also been stated in Paragraph 15 of the petition that till date the petitioner has not got any response from respondent No. 2 even after the expiry

of more than a month from the date of application. Finally, it has been stated in Paragraph 19 of the petition that the petitioner is under an apprehension that any fresh representation to the respondents would not be answered like the letter dated 19.12.2011 and absence of the reply from the respondents would amount to the infringement of the fundamental rights of the petitioner. It has been stated in Paragraph 20 of the petition that respondent No. 2 i.e. Chief Medical Officer, Udham Singh Nagar be directed to decide the fresh representation made by the petitioner expeditiously and impartially.

5. The prayer is innocuous.

6. The petitioner may file a fresh representation before respondent No. 2 within a week from today. If such a representation is made, the authority concerned will consider and decide the matter by passing a reasoned and speaking order without unreasonable delay, but not later than two months from the date of service of a certified copy of the order.

7. With this, the writ petition as well as urgency application (IA No. 684 of 2012) is finally disposed of.