

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-27618-2013 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.10.2016

Sushila Rani

.....Petitioner

versus

The State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldeep Singh

Present: Mr.Ravi Verma, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr.Gaurav Goel, AAG Haryana

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

Petitioner who is a retired Head Teacher from Haryana Education Department, suffered fracture in left leg towards left hip joint. She got treatment from Artemis Health Institute, Gurgaon from 22.1.2011 to 24.1.2011 for which she incurred the expenses to the tune of Rs.66,152/-. As per policy of the Government, Civil Surgeon, Narnaul issued emergency certificate Annexure P4, certifying that the treatment was taken in emergency. After going through the pleadings and various letters, it comes out that the medical bills were submitted. Now the State of Haryana has addressed a communication dated 14.5.2014 (Annexure R1) to the petitioner to re-submit the medical bills. Various other letters Annexures R2 and R3 were also written. On the other hand, the petitioner has filed a copy of the information obtained under RTI Act (Annexure P10), wherein he was supplied the information that his reimbursement bill has been sent to DPEO,

Narnaul vide dispatch No.3514/12. However, there is nothing on file to show that the original reimbursement bills were received by the petitioner for removal of certain objections. In any case, the petitioner denies the possession of the original medical bills and the respondents claim that the same were sent to him. In order to set the controversy at rest, the petitioner, who is in possession of the photocopy of the medical bills, is directed to submit a photocopy of each of the same directly to respondent Nos.2 and 3, who are competent to sanction the said bills. Thereafter, reimbursement order shall be passed within two weeks from the date of the receipt of the said photocopy of the bills. If the reimbursement order is not passed within two weeks, then reimbursement shall carry interest @ 9% per annum from the date of submission of photocopy of bills till payment and in that case, respondent No.1 shall hold an inquiry as to who is liable for the delay, resulting in payment of interest.

The writ petition is allowed accordingly.

27.10.2016
gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes
No