

12    11.3.2021

gd

WPA 6201 of 2021  
(Via Video Conference)

Baldev Bhattacharya  
Vs.  
Coal India Limited and Ors.

Mr. Himadri Shekhar Chakraborty  
Ms. Priyanka Chandra  
Ms. Barnali Gantait  
..for the petitioner

Mr. Sourav Ghosh  
Mr. Snehashis Sen  
Mr. Abhishek Banerjee  
..for the Respondents

The affidavit of service filed in court is kept on record.

The respondents are represented.

The writ petitioner states that he is a retired officer of the first respondent who retired on October 31, 2005 and at present he is aged about 75 years. He had served the Coal India for a long period of about 32 years. The writ petitioner had suffered from Covid-19. The writ petitioner had undergone treatment at the Woodlands Hospital at Kolkata. He had incurred a sum more than Rs.8 lakh for such treatment and had paid the same to the said hospital. Thereafter the writ petitioner raised his claim before the employer, namely, the first respondent and made repeated representations during the period between December 24, 2020 and

January 15, 2021 being annexure “P-8” to the writ petition.

The grievance of the writ petitioner is that, he is entitled to be reimbursed with the entire amount of Rs.8,46,118/- only, out of which he has already received Rs.2,58,112/-. He claimed the balance amount. The writ petitioner submits that he is covered by the Medical Scheme of Coal India which follows the Central Government Health Scheme. It is further submitted on behalf of the writ petitioner that despite repeated representations the respondents did not reply thereto neither released his claim.

Mr. Snehashis Sen, learned Advocate representing the respondents submitted that whatever the writ petitioner was entitled to in terms of the Contributory Post-Retirement Medicare Scheme for executive, such amount had already been released and the writ petitioner had received the same. He further submitted that, such sum was also paid in compliance with the said Central Government Health Scheme.

In view of the aforesaid, it appears that, the representations made by the writ petitioner has not been responded to by the respondents, which an ex-employee of the first respondent can expect legitimately.

After hearing the parties and after perusing the material before this court, this court is of the view that

justice would be sub-served if the concerned official of the first respondent be directed to dispose of the representations being annexure “P-8” to the said writ petition by a common decision within a time frame. Accordingly, such an appropriate and concerned official of the first respondent is directed to consider the representations made by the writ petitioner being annexure “P-8” collectively to the writ petition, within a period of six weeks from the date of communication of this order. The concerned official of the first respondent must give an opportunity of hearing to the writ petitioner or his authorised representative upon prior notice of at least a week to the writ petitioner. The concerned official of the first respondent then will pass a reasoned order and intimate the same to the writ petitioner immediately.

On the above terms, the present writ petition being WPA 6201 of 2021 stands disposed of.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Urgent certified website copies of this order, if applied for, be made available to the parties upon compliance with the requisite formalities.

(Aniruddha Roy, J.)

e