

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

PARAMJIT KAUR AND ORS.

VERSUS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Mr. Arun Gupta, DAG Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

Upon notice of motion, the respondents have filed their reply. In the reply, the respondents have stated that the medical reimbursement has been dealt with the petitioner keeping in view the Instructions issued in this regard.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that though, in case of any emergent situation, the treatment has been undertaken in an hospital, which is not empanelled, only the charges which the Government or an empanelled hospital would have charged the petitioner have been reimbursed and in the present case, a total sum of Rs.13,61,917/- has already been reimbursed to the petitioner and therefore, no grievance can be raised.

The respondents are relying upon the instructions dated 13.02.1995, to contend that the entitled reimbursement has already been allowed in favour of the petitioners.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the present case with their able assistance.

Once under the instructions applicable in the facts and circumstances of this case dated 13.02.1995, the reimbursement of the medical expenses undertaken in the Government Hospital or an empanelled hospital are to be reimbursed, the petitioners who undertook medical treatment in an emergent situation from a Non-Government/Non-Empanelled Hospital, the reimbursement has been done as per the instructions dated 13.02.1995.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have not been able to dispute the said fact that whenever, the employee or a retiree concerned gets a medical treatment from a non-empanelled hospital in an emergent situation, the reimbursement is to be done qua the amount which the employee would have paid in a Government/empanelled hospital. That being so, the petitioner has already been reimbursed of sum of more than Rs.13 lacs (approx.) out of the total Rs.17 lacs (approx.) incurred hence, no grievance can be raised by the petitioner that he is entitled for the full

medical reimbursement unless and until the Instructions dated 13.02.1995, which have been relied by the respondents are under challenge.

Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the present petition.

Hence, the present petition stands dismissed.

Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

09-12-2024
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES/NO
Whether reportable: YES/NO