



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

136

CWP-6152-2026

Date of Decision: 25.03.2026

BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED

...Petitioner

Vs.

MR SOMI LAL AND ANR.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Deepak Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 28.11.2025 whereby District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Tarn Taran Camp Court, Amritsar (for short, "District Commission") has ordered reimbursement of medical claim of respondent-complainant.

2. The petitioner is a Public Sector Undertaking entrusted with providing telecom services across the country. Respondent No.1 was an employee of the petitioner-organization and retired as DE Phones. He was hospitalized on two occasions from 13.02.2017 to 17.02.2017 and 22.02.2017 to 04.03.2017. He filed a complaint before District Commission against the petitioner with a plea to direct it to reimburse the complete medical expenses incurred on account of hospitalization under emergent situation. The District Commission vide order dated 28.11.2025 allowed his claim and directed the petitioner to reimburse complete medical expenses. As per petitioner, the District Commission did not have

the jurisdiction to entertain respondent's grievance as the same lies before Central Administrative Tribunal in view of notification dated 31.10.2008 issued by Department of Personnel and Training, Government of India.

3. The petitioner is disputing jurisdiction of District Commission. The impugned order was passed in its presence. The question whether District Commission had jurisdiction or not itself is a disputed question. Furthermore, this question can very well be raised before appellate forum.

4. Maintainability of writ petition is one aspect and entertainability in view of availability of alternative remedy is another aspect. Considering the availability of remedy of first appeal before State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission and thereafter second appeal before National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, this Court does not deem it appropriate to invoke its writ jurisdiction.

5. Dismissed.

6. It is made clear that the dismissal of petition would not inhibit the petitioner from availing any other alternative remedy.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 25, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No