

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2143 of 2019**

Dr. Sudhanshu Tripathi S/o Sudhir Kumar Tripathi Aged About 29 Years R/o 32 Intact, Dental Clinic, Narmada Nagar, Bilaspur, District- Bilasur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Health And Family Welfare Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Chief Executive Officer, National Health Insurance Scheme, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Director, Health State Nodal Agency For National Health Insurance Scheme, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. United India Insurance Company, Through Regional Manager, Regional Office 648-649, Sixth Floor, Magneto The Mall, Labhandi, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
5. Vidal Health Insurance, Third Party Administrator Private Limited, Tower No.2, 1st Floor, SJR-I, Park, EPIP Zone, Whitefield, Bangalore (Karnataka)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Smt. Hamida Siddiqui, Advocate
-----------------	---	--------------------------------

For State	:	Smt. Astha Shukla, Panel Lawyer
-----------	---	---------------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

01.07.2019

Heard.

1. The petitioner submits that the petitioner was initially enlisted to provide medical services under the scheme of Rastriya Swasthya Bima Yojna and Mukhyamantri Swasthya Bima Yojna. It is stated that Vidal Health was a service provider in between State and the Insurance Company so as to ensure quality of medical treatment provided to the patient for which the insurance was being reimbursed by the State or Union as the case may be.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in January 2018 certain inspections were carried out and non-availability of certain measures and equipments were pointed out for which the petitioner was suspended for a

period of six months vide order dated 13.03.2019 (Annexure P-3). It is further submitted though the said suspension was for six months even after the period of six months has lapsed, the services of the petitioner are not revived for which a representation was made on 17.09.2018 (Annexure P-4). It is further contended that there are certain rules & procedures which governs suspension of service and without following such procedure the suspension cannot be made. The petitioner however at present prays for decision by the State on representation so filed.

3. At this juncture, I am not going into the merits of this case since prayer has been made that the representation which is made by the petitioner may be directed to be decided within a stipulated period and further prayer is also made that the suspension which is also challenged vide Annexure P-5 as illegal may also be decided with a liberty that petitioner may approach this Court again after decision of representation, in case occasion so arises.
4. Under the circumstances, since the enquiry touches upon the fact finding, it is directed that the respondent No.3 shall decide the grievance of the petitioner, which is filed by the petitioner as representation and will also decide the finding of suspension which has been challenged within a further period of 60 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The petitioner if so aggrieved, thereafter, shall be at liberty to approach this Court. It is further made clear that this Court has not made any observation on merits of this case.
5. With such observation, the petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri
Judge