



123

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

CWP-9666-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.04.2026

Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

.Petitioners

Versus

The Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh and another

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Advocate,
for the Caveator-respondent No.2.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 13.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.1-The Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as “the Tribunal”) in O.A. No.060/1007/2024, by which the Tribunal has directed the petitioners to reimburse the full payment to respondent No.2 in respect of a medical bill issued by a private hospital, namely, Healing Hospital, Chandigarh.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Chandigarh Administration-petitioners argued that even if, it is assumed that the treatment was undertaken by respondent No.2 under the emergent situation, then only, as per the Policy, the reimbursment is to be done, based upon the Reimbursement



Rules, according to which, the reimbursement can only be done on PGI/AIIMS rates, which provision has neither been noticed; nor dealt with by the Tribunal.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Advocate, appears and accepts notice on behalf of the Caveator-respondent No.2.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 submits that the benefit has been granted to him based upon the judgments mentioned in paragraph 3 and 7 of the impugned order dated 13.10.2025 (Annexure P-1) but concedes that the Policy which is applicable, has not been discussed while adjudicating the entitlement *qua* the medical reimbursement to the applicant-respondent No.2 herein.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

7. It may be noticed that the medical reimbursement is a concession and the concession has to be given as per the Policy admissible. In the impugned order, the provisions of such Policy, under which the claim was raised for the reimbursement has not even been noticed by the Tribunal, what to talk of discussing the same so as to find out the exact entitlement of respondent No.2.

8. Once, the State raised a plea that the reimbursement can only be done under the Policy, even where the treatment has been undertaken under the emergent situation, the Tribunal should have looked into the relevant Clause(s) of the Policy and then adjudicated the entitlement of respondent No.2.

9. Faced with this situation, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 requests for remanding back the matter to the Tribunal for



fresh adjudication based upon the provisions of the Reimbursement Policy coupled with the settled principles of law on the said issue.

10. Keeping in view the above, the order passed by the Tribunal is set-aside and the case is remanded to the Tribunal for fresh adjudication, which adjudication should be based on the terms & conditions of the Reimbursement/Medical Claim Policy concerned, coupled with the settled principles on the said issue.

11. The parties are directed to appear before the learned Tribunal on 27.04.2026.

12. Disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

13. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, also stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

02.04.2026
SN

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No