

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

44
Division Bench

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक 48 884 सन् 2005

P. 2. L

In the matter of विरुद्ध State of C.

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
		PR 1031/05 Petition of <u>48(PIL)</u> Presented on <u>11-03-05</u> With by Shri <u>Office Referee</u> It be checked filed for.....

49

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR
(Division Bench)

CORAM : Hon'ble Shri S.R. NAYAK, CJ
& Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.884 OF 2005

Petitioner In the matter of Bediya Bai

VERSUS

Respondent State of Chhattisgarh

Present:

Mr. P.R. Patankar, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. VVS Murthy, learned Dy. Advocate General, with Mr. Sumesh Bajaj, learned Dy. Govt. Adv., for the State of Chhattisgarh.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 30th of November 2005)

The following Order of the Court was passed by
S.R. Nayak, CJ:

In the letter dated 25/07/2002 written by mother of the injured to this Court which is treated as writ petition, the author of the letter has requested the Court to issue a direction to the State Government to reimburse the expenses incurred by her towards medical treatment of her daughter. A further direction is also sought to direct investigation of the crime committed by the husband of her daughter by CBI. On service of notice, learned Dy. Advocate General appeared for the State authorities.

50

(2) We have heard learned counsel for the parties. The first prayer cannot be granted in law. If the petitioner has spent money towards medical expenses for the treatment of the injuries sustained by her daughter at the hands ^{of} her husband, the State Government cannot be directed to reimburse the expenses because we do not find any obligation on the part of the State or State Authorities to reimburse the expenses incurred by the petitioner. With regard to the second prayer, suffice it to state that the Dy. Advocate General stated before us that the jurisdictional Police having investigated into the crime and have already filed a charge-sheet against the son-in-law of the petitioner.

(3) In that view of the matter, there is no need to issue any further direction. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Brajesh