

122

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

CWP-20009-2023

Date of decision: 12.09.2023

Dharmvir

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Ramesh Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release the outstanding amount of Rs.3,63,021/- of medical reimbursement with interest from the date of preparation of the medical bill till its realization to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given legal notice dated 12.05.2022 (Annexure P-8) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent No.3 is directed to consider the said legal notice dated 12.05.2022 (Annexure P-8) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious

then to grant necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.3 would consider the said legal notice dated 12.05.2022 (Annexure P-8) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.3 to consider legal notice dated 12.05.2022 (Annexure P-8) in accordance with law within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then respondent No.3 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.3 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently and in accordance with law.

12.09.2023

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No