



CWP-5975-2026

-1-

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

120

CWP-5975-2026

Date of Decision: 20.03.2026

Janmeja Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Wasu, Special Public Prosecutor
for CBI-respondent No.10

**

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. Status report by way of affidavit dated 19.03.2026 of Mr. Dilpreet Singh, I.P.S. Superintendent of Police (City), District S.A.S. Nagar filed on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 4 is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution is seeking direction to respondent No.2 to constitute a Special Investigation Team to be headed by Senior I.P.S. Officer to inquire into fraud committed by respondent No.6-Fortis Hospital in connivance with insurance company.

3. The petitioner claims that he approached Fortis Hospital for eye treatment. There was need of cataract procedure which normally costs ₹50,000-60,000/-. The hospital subjected him two dummy procedures. One was for right eye and another for left. In both the procedures, one injection costing ₹50,000/- was shown to be injected. In the invoices, batch number of



injection was not disclosed. Actually, no procedure was conducted on 06.12.2024 and 21.12.2024. He was actually subjected to procedure on 20.01.2025 on right eye.

4. The respondent constituted Medical Board which vide report dated 03.10.2025 has opined that there was no medical negligence. The question of medical insurance is not within its purview. Office of Superintendent of Police (City), District S.A.S. Nagar has opined that petitioner has remedy to approach Consumer Forum.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that hospital in connivance with insurance officials are committing fraud which entail higher insurance charges in the subsequent years. The authorities are attempting to deflect from their responsibility. No authority is ready to proceed in accordance with law. There is need to register FIR and investigate the matter. The petitioner was subjected to procedures on papers and invoices were raised. There was no actual procedure. There is further need to conduct Forensic Audit.

6. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner has separate remedies with respect to initiation of criminal proceedings. A Board of Doctors has already examined his claim with respect to medical negligence. He has remedy to approach Consumer Forum, if his grievance survives.

7. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

8. This Court especially in the absence of respondent No.6 i.e. Fortis Hospital does not find it appropriate to direct police authorities or any other agency to conduct Forensic Audit or register FIR and thereafter, investigate the matter, however, question of charging ₹50,000/- on two different occasions with respect to an injection without disclosing batch

**CWP-5975-2026****-3-****2026:PHHC:044234**

number needs to be examined. This becomes more important in view of the fact that petitioner is claiming that he was never subjected to two alleged procedures and Medical Board has expressed its inability to find out whether procedure was carried out or not. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to direct Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare to examine petitioner's grievance and redress the same within three months from today.

9. Disposed of in above terms.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

20.03.2026*Mohit Kumar*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No