



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

CWP-15763-2025
Date of Decision:-28.05.2025

Qimti Lal Jain

....Petitioner

Vs.

Haryana Vidyut Parsaran Nigam Ltd. (HVPNL) Through Managing
Director

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Tushar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside/modification of order dated 21.10.2024 whereby respondent has partially reimbursed his medical bills.

2. The petitioner is a retired employee of respondent/HVPNL. He was admitted in SPS Hospital, Ludhiana due to medical emergency. He underwent treatment in Deepak Heart Institute, Ludhiana. He was further admitted in Max Super Specialty Hospital. He incurred medical expenses to the tune of Rs.2,29,639/- in the aforesaid three hospitals. SPS Hospital and Deepak Heart Institute are unapproved hospitals whereas Max Super Specialty Hospital is an approved hospital as per record of the respondent. The petitioner submitted medical bills. The respondent has

sanctioned Rs.89,852/- and rejected the claim of Rs.1,39,787/-.

3. Mr. Rajesh Tushar, Advocate submits that in **CWP-14369-2014** vide order dated 07.01.2016, the respondent was ordered to reimburse entire medical bills. The petitioner received medical treatment from three different hospitals and two were unapproved. The case of petitioner is squarely covered by said order of this Court.

4. From the perusal of order dated 07.01.2016 passed by this Court, it is evident that Court has held that benefit of reimbursement cannot be denied on the ground that hospital was unapproved. In the said case, first bill of a hospital which was unapproved was reimbursed, however, subsequent bills were not reimbursed. The Court had the occasion to consider whether treatment availed from unapproved hospital can be considered for reimbursement.

In the case in hand, the petitioner got treatment from three hospitals and two were unapproved. Despite being unapproved, the respondent reimbursed expenses as per PGIMER, Chandigarh rates. It is not a case of denial of reimbursement of expenses of an unapproved hospital whereas it is a case of quantum of expenses. The respondent has approved expenses as per PGIMER, Chandigarh rates whereas petitioner is claiming reimbursement of expenses charged by hospitals. The respondent has not even fully reimbursed expenses of approved hospital because of rates approved by State Government. There is no instruction/rule prescribing that respondent is bound to reimburse expenses beyond prescribed rates or amount.

5. In the backdrop, this Court does not find any infirmity in order dated 21.10.2024. The present petition deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

28.05.2025

Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No