



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

211

CWP-25694-2018

Date of Decision: 12.05.2026

JAGMAL SINGH**...Petitioner(s)****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS****...Respondent(s)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Aakash Singla, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to reimburse medical expenses incurred by the petitioner for his treatment, and set aside the communication/order dated 04.09.2017, Annexure P-1, whereby the respondents refused to accept the claim.

2. Learned State counsel points out that the petitioner retired from Government service as S. S. Master with effect from 31.03.2012, but submitted his medical reimbursement bills vide representation dated 30.08.2017, which have collectively been placed on record as Annexure P-3. A perusal whereof shows that on all the bills the date of admission in Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, Delhi, is 01.09.2004, and the date of discharge is 08.09.2004. As per the applicable Policy, the bills were required to be submitted within six/twelve months of discharge from the Hospital. Besides, before taking treatment from the private hospital, he was required to take permission from the Government approved hospital and the medical bills were



also required to be countersigned by the Civil Surgeon/Medical Superintendent, which had not been done. Accordingly, the same could not have been accepted.

3. Considering the submissions, this Court finds no merit in the petitioner’s claim. Concededly, it is his own case he took treatment from the private hospital way back in September, 2004; however, for no reason, the bills were not submitted to the Department for claiming medical reimbursement for over twelve years, till he made the representation dated 30.08.2017. No plausible explanation is forthcoming for the inordinate delay. It has been tried to be explained by submitting that the petitioner was bedridden after the treatment, which prevented him from submitting the bills. However, the respondents have placed on record his attendance certificate issued by the concerned Principal, Annexure R-1, to the effect that he worked in School from 11.01.2005 to 31.03.2012. These facts are not in dispute. Further, the bills of medical expenses were not countersigned by the concerned Chief Medical Officer, which was mandatory in terms of the Policy. Accordingly, no exception can be taken to rejection of the claim.

4. Dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

12.05.2026
Ad

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>