

I.A.NO. 6 in Original Suit (s).No(s). 6/1996
STATE OF HARYANA Plaintiff(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & ANR. Defendant(s)
(For directions and office report)

WITH

W.P.(C) No. 455/2005
(With Office Report)
CONMT.PET.(C) No. 511/2004 In ORGNL.SUIT No. 6/1996
(With appln.(s) for directions and Office Report)

Date: 22/02/2017 The application and petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PINAKI CHANDRA GHOSE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMITAVA ROY

For State of Mr. Jagdeep Dhankhar, Sr. Adv.

Haryana/ Mr. Shyam Diwan, Sr. Adv.

Plaintiff Mr. Anish Kumar Gupta, AOR

Mr. R.K. Rajwanshi, Adv.

Mr. Avadhesh Kr. Singh, Adv.

Ms. Priyanka Parida, Adv.

Mr. Chandra Shekar Suman, Adv.

Ms. Deepshikha Bharti, Adv.

Mr. Devender Saini, Adv.

Mr. Shekhar Raj Sharma, Adv.

Mr. B.K. Choudhary, Adv.

Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Uday Aditya Banerjee, Adv.

Mr. Amit Kr., Adv.

Mr. Dinesh Kumar Garg, AOR

For UOI/ Mr. Ranjit Kumar, SG

Defendant Ms. Binu Tamta, Adv.

Mr. S. Wasim A. Qadri, Adv.

Mr. B. Krishna Prasad, AOR

Mr. Pankaj Pandey, Adv.

Mr. M.K. Maroria, AOR

-2-

For State of Mr. Ram Jethmalani, Sr. Adv.

Punjab/ Mr. R.S. Suri, Sr. Adv.

Defendant Mr. Arun Kathpalia, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Mohan V. Katarki, Adv.

Mr. Jagjit Singh Chhabra, AOR

Mr. Vinay K. Shailandra, Adv.

Ms. Lata Krishnamurthy, Adv.

Mr. Saksham Maheshwari, Adv.

Mr. Ajay Awasti, Adv.

Mr. Chirag Madan, Adv.

Ms. Sushma Suri, AOR (N.P.)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

An application has been filed at the hearing on behalf of the State of Punjab. The same may be registered. On the directions of this Court, a copy of the said application has been served on the learned Senior counsel appearing for the plaintiff & State of Haryana and the learned Solicitor General of India.

It has been averred in the application that the political party as named therein has announced its decision to cross the inter-state border and march into the territory of Punjab to dig the SYL canal on 23 rd

February, 2017. It has been alleged that the Government of Haryana has accorded permission therefor. Expressing apprehension that the move, if materializes, would lead to

confrontation between the people of two States, intervention of this Court has been sought for.

We have heard the learned Senior counsel appearing for the parties.

In view of the fact that the interim order passed by this Court in the present proceedings on 30-11-2016 and continued from time to time is still in force, we direct, without making any observation on the merit of the allegations, that the State Governments of Haryana and Punjab would ensure that the law and order situation in both the States be maintained strictly and that no steps in violation of the interim order passed be taken by anyone.

-3-

Mr. Shyam Diwan, learned Senior counsel appearing for the plaintiff - State of Haryana started his arguments on merits at 3.00 p.m. and concluded at 3.45 p.m.

List the matters on 2 nd

March, 2017 at 3.00 p.m. to hear the arguments of Mr. Ram Jethmalani, learned Senior counsel appearing for the State of Punjab on the basis of the counter affidavit and the rejoinder affidavit to the counter affidavit filed by the Union of India in the matters.

We reiterate that the interim order passed by us on 30-11-2016 would continue to operate until further orders.

(VISHAL ANAND)

(SNEH LATA SHARMA)

COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER