

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPIL No. 24 of 2017**

In Reference Court On Its Own Motion (Regarding Death of Ku. Divya Verma, D/o Shri Ashok Verma Due to Rabies), Shri Ashok Verma S/o Late Shri Seeta Ram Verma, Makan No. 1562, Buniyadnagar, Chhatava Talab, Bhanpuri, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Health, Mahanadi Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Chhattisgarh Medical Council, Through Its Registrar First Floor, Dr. Balmukund Sharma Clinic Kankali Para, Near Nagar Nigam Ayurvedic Hospital, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, 492001.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Abhishek Sinha, Advocate appears as *Amicus Curiae*.
For State : Shri Y.S. Thakur, Additional Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu****Judgment on Board****Per Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice****26.09.2018**

1. Heard counsel for the parties, specially the *Amicus Curiae*.
2. Compensation of Rs.10 lakhs which was quantified by the High Court has already been paid to the mother of the victim girl, who died of Rabies. In addition to that various efforts made and directions given by the High Court to provide treatment to victims of dog bite or those suffering from Rabies have also been detailed in various affidavits filed on behalf of the State. *Prima Facie*, we are satisfied that the State has been galvanized into understanding the seriousness of the cause and the steps, which have now been taken but were missing earlier. However, the Court observes that the standard operating procedure which has been put in place will also be monitored by appropriate authority, whether the said procedure is being followed or it has only remained

in paper. Not only this efforts would be required to be taken to make available Anti-Rabies medicines to the widest section of the society, as well as the geographical boundary of the State of Chhattisgarh to prevent deaths due to dog bites or be minimized.

3. The PIL now stands disposed off with the above observations.
4. The proceedings initiated against the hospital will be taken to its logical end by the concerned authority and disposal of the PIL may not be treated as a closure of the issue.

Sd /-

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)
Chief Justice

Sd /-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge