



231

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

CWP-8500-2018

Date of decision: 26.11.2025

Rakesh Kumar Gautam

...Petitioner

Versus

The Haryana Agro Industries Corporation and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Nishant Raj, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr. Padamkant Dwivedi, Advocate
for respondents No.1 & 2.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to reimburse the amount of medical expenses to the petitioner which were occurred by him on the treatment of his wife, namely, Gayatri (since deceased).

2. On 03.10.2024, the following order was passed:-

'None has appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

The present is a case where the petitioner is seeking medical reimbursement.

Mr. Padamkant Dwivedi, learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2 has stated that since the policy for grant of medical reimbursement was introduced on 01.01.2013 and medical reimbursement is sought for the period prior to that. He submitted that since the policy did not operate retrospectively, the case of the petitioner was sent to the State Government for seeking approval but the State Government has raised some queries, to which the respondent-Corporation has already



CWP-8500-2018

-2-

answered and the matter is now pending with the State Government.

In view of the above, the State of Haryana through its Director General, Health Services is impleaded as respondent No.3 in the present writ petition. Registry is directed to correct the memo of parties.

Notice of motion to the newly added respondent No.3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Kapil Bansal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of newly added respondent No.3 and submitted that in view of the aforesaid factual position as stated by Mr. Padamkant Dwivedi, learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2, in case any such communication from respondents No.1 and 2 is pending with the State, then the State will take a final decision on the same within a period of two months from today and apprise this Court by placing on record the decision taken.

Adjourned to 21.01.2025.'

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation at the outset submits that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, respondent No.3 has communicated to the respondent-Corporation. The case of the petitioner was required to be considered by the respondent-Corporation in terms of instructions dated 11.12.2003 by granting of relaxation. As such, the claim of the petitioner would be considered and decided accordingly within a period of three months and admissible benefits entitled to the petitioner would be released within a period of one month, thereafter.

4. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent-Corporation to consider and decide the claim raised by the petitioner in terms of communication received from the State Government by passing a speaking order, within a period of 03 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be

conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted by the respondent-Corporation further within a period of one month.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

26.11.2025
Neha

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