

Assam vs The State Of Assam And 5 Ors on 23 November, 2022

Author: Michael Zothankhuma

Bench: Michael Zothankhuma

Page No.# 1/3

GAHC010174172022

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/5687/2022

M/S MB OMM
GUIJAN GHAT, P.O- RANGAGORAH, GUIJAN, DIST- TINSUKIA, ASSAM, PIN-
786147,
HAVING GST REGD NO.-18AVWPD8621M1ZU AND LICENSE NO.
10317017000176 ISSUED
UNDER FOOD SAFETY AND STANDARDS ACT,2006 BY THE GOVT. OF
ASSAM,
COMMISSIONERATE OF FOOD SAFETY, ASSAM, UNDER HEALTH AND
FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT, ASSAM,
A HOUSE BOAT, WHICH IS PROPRIETORIAL CONCERN OF PRASSANNA
DAS,
AGE -62 YRS,
S/O- LATE PARSURAM DAS,
R/O- VILLAGE GUIJAN,
P.O- RANGAGORAH,
P.S AND DIST- TINSUKIA

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 5 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVT.
OF ASSAM, TOURISM DEPARTMENT, GOVT. OF ASSAM, SACHIVALAYA,
DISPUR, GUWAHATI- 781006, ASSAM.

2:THE ASSAM TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED
ASOM PARYATAN BHAWAN (4TH FLOOR)
A.K. AZAD ROAD
PALTAN BAZAR
GUWAHATI- 781008

REPRESENTED BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR

Page No.# 2/3

ASSAM TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED
ASOM PARYATAN BHAWAN (4TH FLOOR)
A.K. AZAD ROAD
PALTAN BAZAR
GUWAHATI- 781008.

3:THE MANAGING DIRECTOR

ASSAM TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED
ASOM PARYATAN BHAWAN (4TH FLOOR)
A.K. AZAD ROAD
PALTAN BAZAR
GUWAHATI- 781008.

4:TECHNICAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE
REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN PRABHASH CH. SARMA
ADDL. GEN. MANAGER (I)

ASSAM TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED
ASOM PARYATAN BHAWAN (4TH FLOOR)
A.K. AZAD ROAD
PALTAN BAZAR
GUWAHATI- 781008.

5:PADMINI RESORTS
REP. BY ONE OF ITS PARTNERS VIVEK AGARWAL

BAZALTOLI BANGALI GAON
P.O- RANGAGORAH
P.S AND DIST- TINSUKIA
ASSAM

6:PRISMATIC HOTELS PRIVATE LIMITED
A PRIVAATE LIMITED COMPANY REP. BY PRANJAL KUMAR MOHAN

DIRECTOR OF PRISMATIC HOTELS PRIVATE LIMITED

RANGAGORA ROAD
AROMA RESIDENCY
TINSUKIA ASSAM
PIN-78612

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. S BANIK

Advocate for the Respondent : GA, ASSAM

Page No.# 3

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MICHAEL ZOTHANKHUMA

ORDER

23.11.2022 Mr. S. Banik, learned counsel appears for the petitioner. Mr. A. Borpujari, learned counsel appears for the respondent Nos. 2 - 4 and Mr. M. Chetia, learned counsel appears for the respondent No. 1.

The affidavit of service filed by the petitioner indicates that though the respondent No. 6 has been given Dasti Service of the notice, the respondent No. 5, which is represented by Vivek Agarwal has not received the Dasti Service of the notice.

In view of the above, though the notice can be said to be served upon the respondent No. 6, it cannot be said to be served upon the respondent No. 5.

Petitioner is given liberty to serve notice on the respondent No. 5 by Dasti Service afresh within 2 weeks.

List the matter after 2 (two) weeks.

In the meanwhile, the respondents may file their affidavit-in-opposition.

Interim order passed earlier to continue till the next date.

JUDGE Comparing Assistant