

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

LPA No. 815 of 2015 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION : 27.05.2015

Radhey Shyam Kapoor

.... APPELLANT

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.... RESPONDENTS

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present : Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate,
for the appellant.

* * *

SATISH KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

This intra-court appeal under Clause X of the Letters Patent has been filed against the order dated 18.05.2015 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the writ petition (CWP No. 19209 of 2014) filed by the appellant seeking direction to the respondents to pay interest on the delayed amount of payment of medical reimbursement, has been dismissed.

After hearing learned counsel for the appellant, we do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order.

In this case, only issue of interest has been raised, and that too on the meager amount of ₹ 79,274/-. Earlier, the appellant filed a writ petition (CWP No. 13499 of 2006) claiming reimbursement of medical expenses. Vide order dated 07.11.2013 (Annexure P-1), the said petition

was allowed and the respondents were directed to consider the claim of the appellant for medical reimbursement by treating him as indoor patient. The respondents were further directed to make the payment of medical reimbursement to the appellant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of the order, failing which the appellant was held entitled to claim the same with interest @ 8% per annum from the date of submission of the bill till the date of payment.

In the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge, it has been mentioned that copy of the aforesaid order dated 07.11.2013 was made available by the appellant to the respondents on 13.02.2014 and the amount was released to him on 23.05.2014, well within the period stipulated in the order. Merely because there is delay of just 10 days in making the said payment, we are not inclined to accept the contention of the appellant that he is entitled for interest from the date of submission of the bill till the date of payment. We do not find any ground to interfere with the order passed by the learned Single Judge.

No merit. Dismissed.

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

May 27, 2015
ndj

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE