2026:UHC:2224

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Misc. Single No.752 of 2026

31st March, 2026

Rankers Hospital SIDCUL .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and others .....Respondents

Presence:-
Mr. Gopal K. Verma, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. Yogesh Pandey, learned D.A.G. for the State.
Mr. Hari Mohan Bhatia, learned counsel for respondent nos.2 and 3.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

Petitioner is a hospital situated at SIDCUL, Haridwar. Admittedly an M.O.U. was entered into between the petitioner-Hospital and respondent nos.2 and 3 whereby it was provided that workers working in the local factories will be given treatment by the petitioner-Hospital and the expenses of the treatment, given to the workers, would be reimbursed by respondent nos.2 and 3.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that 128 such treatments have been given to the workers of the area. The respondent nos.2 and 3 examined the bills/claims submitted by the petitioner-Hospital and found that 98 of the claims, as per the M.O.U., were inappropriate and only 30 claims were found to be appropriate.

3. It was also found by respondent nos.2 and 3 that inflated bill was submitted by the petitioner-Hospital and an excess amount to the tune of ₹30,48,353/-has been claimed which resulted into imposing of penalty of ₹2,98,65,710/- upon the petitioner-Hospital vide impugned order dated 08.01.2026, annexure no.1 to the writ petition.

4. Though the petitioner-Hospital has challenged this order in the present writ petition but at this stage learned counsel for the petitioner does not press for the said prayer since there is an arbitration clause in the M.O.U. therefore the order dated 08.01.2026 be gone into by the arbitrator appointed by the parties. He limited his prayer to the extent that the representation which has been submitted by the petitioner-Hospital before the respondent nos.2 and 3, annexure no.4 to the writ petition, be directed to be decided within a stipulated period.

5. Accordingly writ petition is dismissed so far as prayer no.1 is concerned.

6. Since the learned counsel for the petitioner limited his argument and made a prayer before this Court that representation dated 12.03.2026, annexure no.4 to the writ petition, be directed to be decided within a stipulated period by respondent nos.2 and 3 by a reasonable speaking order, this Court proceeds to dispose of the writ petition finally.

7. Accordingly writ petition is finally disposed of and it is provided that respondent no.2-Director, Employees State Insurance Corporation, Dehradun, shall decide the representation dated 12.03.2026, annexure no.4 to the writ petition, filed by the petitioner-Hospital within a period of six weeks from today, by a speaking order.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
31.03.2026

SK