

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20072 of 2017
DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 06, 2017

TARLOK SINGH

.....PETITIONER..

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

.....RESPONDENTS..

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ especially in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to make payment as medical reimbursement to the tune of ₹1,21,162/- on account of heart ailment.

2. Notice of motion.

3. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Manoj Bajaj, Additional Advocate General, Punjab has accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned counsel for the petitioner is advised to supply requisite number of copies of the paper book to learned State counsel, during the course of the day.

4. During the course of arguments, it has emerged that petitioner submitted medical bills in the year 2012 and a cheque bearing No.202609, dated

30.03.2012 for a sum of ₹1,21,162/- was issued on account of medical reimbursement but on presentation of said cheque to Axis Bank Ltd., Mall Road, Ludhiana, it stood dishonoured. Subsequently, a fresh bill was prepared by the concerned authorities bearing No.155, dated 03.01.2014, in respect of the aforesaid amount of ₹1,21,162/- for getting accorded the sanction but till date the payment by way of reimbursement of bill has not so far been disbursed to the petitioner. Even, a representation dated 18.11.2016 (P-4) was also moved to the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (HOFF), Punjab but till date neither payment of the medical reimbursement has been released nor any proper response has been received.

5. Accordingly, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Punjab (HOFF), Sector 68, SAS Nagar Mohali to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his representation dated 18.11.2016 (P-4) and to get the needful done, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. However, in case, the petitioner still feels aggrieved of the order passed by respondent No.2, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

SEPTEMBER 06, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*