



\$~69

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 16539/2025**

Date of Decision: **23.02.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

VIKAS NAGAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Singla, Ms. Supriya Juneja and Mr. Dhananjay Gautam, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

The present proceedings emanate from the directions issued by this Court, pursuant to which the respondent has passed a reasoned and speaking order dated 20.06.2025.

2. The controversy in the present case relates to the entitlement and extent of benefits admissible to a Card holder under the Central Government Health Scheme (CGHS).

3. Respondent No. 2, Mr. Shyam Singh Khinchee, is a retired officer of the Government of India. His daughter was married to the petitioner. At the



relevant time, matrimonial proceedings, including a petition for divorce, were pending between the petitioner and the daughter of Respondent No. 2. It is placed on record that the daughter of Respondent No. 2, who was the wife of the petitioner, has since passed away. The petitioner, however, seeks action against respondent no.2 who is the father of the petitioner's late wife for induction of her daughter in the list of beneficiaries under the CGHS. The impugned order records that the application dated 31.05.2007, along with the relevant documents, was duly examined in accordance with the guidelines of the CGHS. The said guidelines permit the inclusion of separated, divorced, or abandoned daughters as dependents under the CGHS, subject to the conditions that they reside with the CGHS beneficiary and have an income below ₹9,000/- per month plus Dearness Relief (DR).

4. It is apparent that the Department proceeded to register the name in question without being informed as to whether the petitioner's wife was legally divorced, separated, or otherwise. The impugned order accordingly records that the failure to disclose the said material facts was solely attributable to Respondent No. 2. It is recorded that the Department was under no obligation to verify the facts beyond the affidavit and documents produced, particularly in the absence of contradictory information in the public domain or within Department's records.

5. The Department, thus, found that it acted in good faith and in accordance with applicable policy and procedure while issuing the CGHS card, and, there was no administrative lapse or procedural irregularity on part of the Department since there is no evidence of dual benefit having been claimed or paid. The complaint was, therefore, closed.

6. During the course of hearing, it has also been considered that there is



no evidence of availing the dual benefit.

7. Mr. Aditya Singla, learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the name of the petitioner's late wife ought not to have been inducted, when she was not legally separated and, therefore, the act of respondent no.2 to the contrary attracts a cognizable offence. He points out from the information submitted by respondent in response to the application dated 07.02.2022 under the Right to Information Act, 2005. Be that as it may, the aforesaid act whether would attract any cognizable offence or otherwise, is not the nature of the inquiry which the Court under Article 226 should undertake.

8. Since the petitioner's application has been rejected by speaking order while finding that no action is contemplated, the petitioner, therefore, shall be at liberty to take any other appropriate recourse in accordance with law. The writ which essentially is a public law remedy, cannot be permitted to be invoked as a forum for settling private disputes or pursuing personal vendettas between individuals.

9. With the aforesaid observations, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 23, 2026

aks/ap