



2026:UHC:4733-DB

Sl. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPSB No.244 of 2020 <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u> <u>Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.</u> There is no representation for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Sushil Vashisth, learned S.C. for the State. 3. Ms. Sangeeta Adhikari Patni, learned Counsel i/b Mr. N.S. Pundir, learned Counsel for respondent nos.2, 4 and 5. 4. Mr. Dushyant Mainali, learned Counsel for respondent nos.6 and 7. 5. By means of this petition, petitioner has sought a writ of mandamus commanding the respondent authorities to release the amount of medical reimbursement to the petitioner with interest. 6. According to petitioner, she is the wife of late 'Bhim Sen Dhiraj' who served as Executive Engineer in Uttaranchal Pay Jal Nigam. He retired in the year 2012 and thereafter, he passed away on 09.08.2015. Petitioner has staked claim for the amount which was allegedly spent in treatment of her husband. Petitioner states that her husband married with respondent no.6 during subsistence of first marriage. It is not in dispute that petitioner's husband underwent treatment at <i>Medanta Hospital</i>, Gurgaon (Haryana) and a substantial amount was spent in his treatment. The medical bills regarding said treatment were submitted to the State Government for reimbursement which were to the tune of Rs.34,83,521/- and the competent authority i.e. State Government sanctioned a sum of Rs.20,62,866/- for reimbursement vide order dated 15.06.2016. The said amount, however, has not been released to any of the family members of late 'Bhim Sen Dhiraj'. 7. Petitioner contends that she is entitled to reimbursement of the amount spent in treatment of her husband, while respondent no.6, who claims to be the second wife of late 'Bhim Sen Dhiraj', submits that the entire amount was spent by her



and her son (respondent no.7), therefore, the said amount deserves to be released in her favour.

8. Mr. Dushyant Mainali, learned Counsel appearing for respondent nos.6 and 7 submits that his clients have furnished vouchers regarding the expenditure incurred by her clients to the competent authority, copies whereof have also been enclosed with the writ petition.

9. Thus, there are rival claims set up by petitioner as well as respondent nos.6 and 7 for release of the aforesaid amount.

10. This Court is not inclined to go into this disputed question whether petitioner had spent money in treatment of her husband or whether respondent nos.6 and 7 actually incurred the amount spent in treatment of late 'Bhim Sen Dhiraj'.

11. Having regard to the circumstances of the case and also in view of the fact that the amount was sanctioned in the year 2016, we dispose of present writ petition with liberty to petitioner/her dependents to approach the competent authority i.e. Secretary, Pey Jal Nigam by making a representation. If such representation is made within four weeks from today, Secretary concerned shall take decision thereupon as per law within four months thereafter. It goes without saying that respondent nos.6 and 7 shall also be heard by the concerned Secretary before taking any decision in the matter.

12. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.)

12.06.2026

Rdang