HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 38677 of 2026

Maha Laxmi Hospital Eye Care And Trauma Centre

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Of India And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Sanjay Maurya
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I., C.S.C., Chandan Agarwal, Vinay Kumar Singh

---

Court No. - 1

HON'BLE AJIT KUMAR, J.
HON'BLE GARIMA PRASHAD, J.

1. Heard Shri Sanjay Maurya, learned counsel for the petitioner and Shri Chandan Agrawal, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 4, 5 and 6.

2. The petitioner's hospital is already on the panel of the Government under the Ayushman Bharat Scheme. However, its registration/empanelment has been suspended on the ground that the explanation submitted in response to the show-cause notice was not found satisfactory.

3. Learned counsel for respondent Nos. 4, 5 and 6 is directed to obtain instructions in the matter.

4. The contention advanced by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is that the petitioner's reply was not considered in its proper perspective before suspending the empanelment of the petitioner's hospital.

5. Learned counsel for respondent Nos. 4, 5 and 6 submits that the explanation has been duly considered and that, with regard to Observation Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 7, the explanation was not found satisfactory. He has taken us through the show-cause notice and the reply submitted by the petitioner. He, however, submits that the empanelment has merely been suspended and that the State Empanelment Committee has already considered the petitioner's reply. The minutes of the meeting are available with him, meaning thereby, that the State Empanelment Committee has already taken a decision with regard to the proposed de-empanelment of the hospital under the Scheme. He submits that a final decision is yet to be taken and the final order is yet to be passed. However, in the event that an adverse final order is passed, the petitioner shall have the opportunity to approach the State Grievance Redressal Committee, headed by the

Principal Secretary, Medical Health.

6. In view of the above, we decline to grant any indulgence in the matter of suspension now at this state. We provide that the respondent authorities shall issue a formal order after considering the objections of the petitioner within a period of two weeks.

7. In the event that the order is adverse to the petitioner, the petitioner shall have the right to approach the State Grievance Redressal Committee within a further period of four weeks.

8. The State Grievance Redressal Committee shall take a decision within a further period of one month.

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

(Garima Prashad,J.) (Ajit Kumar,J.)

October 23, 2026
Sachin Mishra

Digitally signed by :-
SACHIN MISHRA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad