



\$~8

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 5228/2015 and CM APPL.9478/2015

FLT. LT. RAJAN DHALL CHARITABLE TRUSTPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Puri, Sr. Adv. alongwith
Ms. Pragya Puri, Advocates.

versus

PRABHAT KUMAR AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Rashika Chopra, Adv for R1
alongwith R1-in-person.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R3.
Mr. T. Sannu and Mr. Utkarsh Singh,
Advocates for GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **29.04.2025**

1. The present petition pertains to information sought by the respondent no. 1 as an RTI applicant in respect of the treatment availed by his father in the petitioner's hospital (hereinafter referred to as '*the hospital*').

2. *Vide order dated 19.03.2025, it was directed as under:-*

"1. After some hearing, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that all the relevant medical documents/ records as sought by respondent no.1 have been handed over to the respondent no.1. It is further submitted that if there are any other outstanding documents/records which are sought by the respondent no.1, the same shall also be duly provided to the respondent no.1, if the same are available.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent no.1 submits that a copy of the outstanding medical documents/ records which are desired from the hospital shall be duly intimated to the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, who shall endeavour to ensure that the same are provided to learned counsel for the respondent no.1."

3. It is stated by learned senior counsel for the petitioner that pursuant thereto, all relevant documents which were in possession of the hospital



have been duly supplied to the respondent no. 1. The hard copies of the same have again been handed over to the respondent no. 1 during the course of hearing today. However, there exists a controversy as to whether a copy of the entire bill raised by the hospital has been handed over to the respondent no. 1 or not.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, submits that the quantum of the entire bill for the period, during which the respondent no. 1's father was hospitalized, was to the tune of Rs. 16,79,348/-. He submits that a copy of the said bill, setting out the itemised breakup of the said amount, has been provided to the respondent no. 1. It is further stated by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, that apart from the said amount of Rs. 16,79,348/-, no further amount was charged from the respondent no. 1 for the treatment of respondent no. 1's father during the period he was admitted in the petitioner's hospital.

5. The respondent no. 1, however, insists that in addition to an amount of Rs. 16,79,348/-, a further sum of Rs. 2,40,000/- was paid by the respondent no. 1 to the concerned hospital on the latter's demand. This is, however, refuted by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner.

6. Be that as it may, since the present petition pertains to the information sought as regards the treatment availed by the respondent no. 1's father in the petitioner's hospital, and since all the documents in the possession of the hospital have already been handed over to the respondent no. 1 (without withholding any part of the same), no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition as regards the supply of information.

7. Further, in view of the fact that the hospital has now supplied the entire information which was in its power and possession, the adverse



observations made in the impugned order which castigate the petitioner for non-supply thereof, are set aside.

8. The legal rights and remedies of the respondents to take appropriate action against the hospital for alleged medical negligence/overcharging are expressly reserved. However, it is made clear that this order shall not be constructed as an expression of opinion of this court as regards thereto.

9. The present petition is disposed of in the above terms.

SACHIN DATTA, J

APRIL 29, 2025/at