



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

102+208

***CM-1315-CWP-2026 in/and
CWP-25015-2016 (O&M)***

Decided on : 10.02.2026

JASVIR KUMARI

...Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

PRESENT: None for the petitioner .

Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate
for respondent No. 1.

Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Advocate for the respondents No. 2 and 3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

CM-1315-CWP-2026

The prayer in the present application filed is for placing on record the Annexure R-11 i.e. clarification with respect to availability of MVR Valve Repair/Replacement Paediatric Surgery at AIIMS, New Delhi, in compliance of the order dated 29.09.2025 passed by this Court.

Keeping in view the averments mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Copy of Annexure R-11 is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

CWP-25015-2016

1. In the present petition, the reimbursement is being claimed qua the treatment undertaken by the son of the petitioner which was allowed on the basis of the rate fixed by the AIIMS. An arguments was raised by the learned counsel for the respondents that the treatment which was given to the son of the petitioner was not available at AIIMs, therefore, the calculation of reimbursement on AIIMS rates is incorrect.

2. Keeping in view the said assertion, the following order was passed by this Court on 29.09.2025.



**CM-1315-CWP-2026 in/and
CWP-25015-2016 (O&M)**

“Learned counsel for the respondents seeks a short adjournment to get instructions whether the facility of surgery, which was undergone by the petitioner’s son, was available at AIIMS or not at the time when he was operated upon, so as to apply AIIMS rates for the grant of reimbursement.

Adjourned to 19.11.2025.

It is made clear that no further adjournment shall be granted on the said date. ”

3. In pursuance to the aforesaid order dated 29.09.2025, an affidavit has been filed by the respondents-UOI, wherein, the AIIMS has stated that the treatment undertaken by the son of the petitioner was very much available at the relevant point of time. That being so, the grant of reimbursement at the rate of AIIMS, prima facie cannot be treated as arbitrary and illegal.

4. Further, for the last hearing, no one has appeared on behalf of the petitioner so as to press the present petition, hence, it can be safely presumed that the petitioner may be satisfied with the factual averments given herein above.

5. Dismissed for non- prosecution.

6. Pending civil miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

**(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE**

10.02.2026

Riya

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