

CWP No. 11774 of 2018
DECIDED ON: MAY 17, 2018

SURJIT KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Sarbjit Singh Khaira, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to pay him ₹2,54,000/-, as he is entitled under Punjab Govt. Employees and Pensioners Health Insurance Scheme to cover indoor medical expenses.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has *inter-alia* contended that petitioner retired on 31.03.2015 on attaining the age of superannuation and after his retirement has undergone some medical treatment regarding which he submitted medical bills (Annexures P-1 and P-2) in the office of respondent

No.2-Managing Director, India Healthcare Services, D-38, Mohali, near Max Pro Park, Industrial Area, Phase-I, Chandigarh, which was received in the said office against receipt No. 35449, dated 19.11.2016 but no action has been taken till date. Thereafter petitioner, being constrained against the in-action on the part of respondents, served legal notice dated 18.08.2017 (P-4), which was duly served upon the respondents. In response to the afore-said notice, it has simply been unfolded that the claim submitted by the petitioner has not been received in the office of respondent No.2 and as such, settlement could not be there. But one thing is evident from the receipt register dated 19.11.2016 that the bills were submitted in the office of respondent No.2 and if, it has been misplaced or are not traceable, respondents could have requested the petitioner to submit afresh bills or copy thereof, for initiation of proceedings for reimbursement thereof. But instead of doing so, bills were declined simply showing that it has not been received in the office.

3. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is in possession of copies of the bills which were earlier submitted to the office of respondent No.2 and the instant petition can be disposed of by giving necessary directions in this regard.

4. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to petitioner to submit the bills or copies thereof, which were submitted earlier on 19.11.2016, afresh to the office of respondent No.2 within a week from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and receipt of said bills, respondent No.2 is directed to do the needful within a period of next one month positively.

5. However, in case petitioner still feels aggrieved by any in-action of the afore-authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available to him under law as well as to approach this Court.

MAY 17, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>