

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

(222)

CWP-13948-2016

Date of Decision: March 01, 2019

Prabhu Dayal Madan

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Dinesh Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanjit Singh Bakhshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Amit Rao, Advocate, for

Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate, for respondents No. 2 to 4.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(ORAL)

In the present writ petition, the petitioner is claiming the reimbursement of the medical bills submitted by the petitioner as the petitioner undertook the medical treatment in May, 2014 for his urinary problem.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner spent an amount of Rs.1,27,307/- on the said treatment whereas, the respondents in an arbitrary manner, only released a sum of Rs.42,787/-.

The present writ petition has been filed seeking the release of the balance amount.

In reply to the writ petition, the respondents have stated that the petitioner was to undertake the medical reimbursement in view of the policy dated 31.01.2014, which was applicable, according to which, Mann Multi Specialist Hospital, Rohtak, where the petitioner undertook the treatment, the reimbursement was to be done on the PGI rates/AIIMS rates and therefore the amount which has already been sanctioned in favour of the petitioner is perfectly valid.

Learned counsel for the respondents have gone to the extent to say that as per the policy dated 06.08.2013, for the treatment which the petitioner undertook, there was a package of Rs.25,000/- plus room rent according to which the petitioner was entitled to only a sum of Rs.28,000/- but still the petitioner has been paid more on the basis of the PGI rates.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

It is not disputed that when the petitioner undertook the medical treatment, the hospital from where the treatment was undertaken, was empaneled hospital, empaneled by the respondents vide notification dated 31.01.2014. In the said notification, it is clearly mentioned that whatever the treatment has been taken from the said hospital, the reimbursement will be on the rates of PGI Chandigarh/AIIMS, New Delhi. This notification is not under challenge. From the reply, it is clear that the respondents have paid the amount of Rs.42,787/-, which the petitioner was entitled for on the PGI/AIIMS rates.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that no calculation has been given to the petitioner as to how the amount of Rs.42,787/- has been calculated by the respondents.

The petitioner is free to approach the respondents to get the said calculation under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to interfere in the present order.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

March 01, 2019
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No