

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 256 of 2021**

Dhansingh Yadav S/o Deendayal Yadav Aged About 60 Years Working As Chowkidar, Posted At Janpad Panchayat Lormi, Block Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.), R/o Village- Tulsaghat, Post Nawadih, Lormi, District- Mungeli (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Health Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)
2. Director Health Education/ Health Services, Chhattisgarh, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Collector Mungeli, District - Mungeli (C.G.)
4. C.M.O. District Hospital Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
5. Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat, Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
6. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat, Lormi, District- Mungeli (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. K.S. Pawar, Advocate along with Mr. Shashi Kumar Kushwaha, Adv.
For State	:	Mr. Rahul Jha, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****03/02/2021**

1. The limited grievance that the petitioner in the present writ petition has is in respect of the non-releasing of the medical reimbursement

amount, which the petitioner has incurred in the course of his treatment between the period 18.12.2013 to 15.01.2014.

2. The brief facts relevant for the adjudication of the present case is that the petitioner, working on the post of Peon under the respondent No.6, suffered with some intestine ailments for which he was hospitalized for a period between 18.12.2013 to 15.01.2014. In between a bill of Rs.9,06,358/- was raised by the hospital authorities. The petitioner submitted this bill for medical reimbursement in the Department. The respondent No.4 initially processed the same and sanctioned an amount of about Rs 7 lakhs and forwarded for further clearance to the respondent No.6, who forwarded the same for necessary sanction to the respondent No.2 vide order dated 16.12.2020, which till date is pending consideration before the respondent No.2.
3. The limited prayer that the petitioner has is for an appropriate direction to the respondent authorities to ensure that a prompt decision is taken on the claim raised by the petitioner as forwarded by the respondent No.6 to the respondent No.2.
4. The aforesaid limited prayer is not opposed by the State counsel.
5. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of directing the respondent No.2 to take an appropriate decision in accordance with the Rules governing the field ensuring a prompt decision on the claim of the petitioner at the earliest preferably within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.

6. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to apprise the respondent No.2, so far as the order passed by this Court is concerned. A prompt decision is expected from the authorities taking into consideration the fact that the bills are of the year 2013-14.
7. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved