

Neutral Citation No. (2026:JHHC:18396-DB)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
L.P.A. No. 252 of 2026**

Rahul Kumar, S/o Sri Ramesh Prasad Gupta, R/o
Village- Bijupura, P.O.- Tangar, P.S.- Chahno, District-
Ranchi, Jharkhand **Appellant**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Home Government of Jharkhand, having its office at Nepal House, P.O. & P.S.- Doranda, District- Ranchi
3. The District Legal Services Authority (DLSA) Ranchi through its Member Secretary having its office at Civil Court- Ranchi, P.O.-GPO, P.S.-Kotwali, District- Ranchi

... .. **Respondents**

PRESENT

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA**

For the Appellant : Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. M. Dubey, A.C. to A.G.

C.A.V. on 27/04/2026

Pronounced on 19/06/2026

Per Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.

A virulent regressive and a potent attack with acid on the appellant/writ-petitioner had not only caused disfigurement of his face but more notably disfigurement of his soul which has further been compounded by the utter lack of sensitivity on the part of the State doling out a compensation which for a male victim in particular, does not even compensate a miniscule percentage of the trauma the appellant writ-petitioner had undergone and which is not likely to subside in the near future.

2. Before venturing out to consider the legality and correctness of the order dated 27.11.2019 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(C) No. 2683 of 2018 the delay in filing the appeal has to be considered at the first instance. The application for condonation of delay has been filed through I.A. No. 11207 of 2025. There has been a delay of 1374 days in filing the appeal.

3. Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, learned counsel appearing for the appellant has submitted that Section 5 of the Limitation Act for the purposes of condonation of delay refers to the term “sufficient cause” and the same would be a valid reason to condone the delay. The purpose of Section 5 of the Limitation Act is intended to meet the reasons which must appear “sufficient” in the facts and circumstances of the case to satisfy the Court that the person concerned would not have taken recourse in preferring appeal even if he had wanted to during the prescribed period of limitation. The preference of an appeal/ application within the prescribed period of limitation is a regular routine procedure prescribed but at the same time it is necessary that this regular procedure is followed strictly in cases involving contractual claims for specific relief, setting aside of an ex parte decree or regular civil or criminal appeals etc. in which consciousness and efforts of the appellant/applicant regarding limitation would be judged for “sufficient cause” *stricto sensu*. According to Mrs. Bhagat, learned counsel for the appellant the present appeal projects itself as an exceptional case wherein the appellant/ writ-petitioner being an acid attack survivor had only two options; either to prefer an appeal within time and wait for financial aid or to undergo treatments and surgery first in the hope that the Courts are always open to protection of his fundamental rights. It has been submitted that an acid attack survivor is a victim for lifetime and an appeal preferred by such victim beyond the period of limitation should not be an impediment in his quest for redressal of his grievance. The appellant/writ-petitioner was undergoing treatment and surgeries as he was subjected to an acid attack and has suffered 45% disability and is not leading a normal life which has been permanently affected. The limitation had expired on 04.01.2020 which was

the peak period of Covid-19 and which was also one of the reasons for condonation of delay. Advancing her argument Mrs. Bhagat, learned counsel has submitted that the appellant has, as yet, undergone 14 plastic surgeries and he has also lost a major part of his eye-sight apart from the fact that he has no source of income and is facing a severe financial crunch. The parents of the appellant are old and ailing persons and they were not able to hire a lawyer and in fact, the appeal has been preferred through the High Court Legal Services Committee. Learned counsel has made further submission that the appellant is a law-abiding citizen and is nowhere at fault; moreover, he is the victim of the worse form of social crime in India. Therefore, protection of his person and life is his constitutional right and it is prayed and expected that the Court would not deny his constitutional right and the right to life due to the delay in filing of the appeal. The appellant has genuine grounds and has valid reasons which is bona fide and is in good faith. It has also been submitted that the appellant has chosen life over litigation and had prioritized his treatment by his own means as the Doctors have suggested that any delay in treatment will rot and contaminate his body parts. Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, learned counsel has also referred to the Supplementary Affidavit filed by her wherein various medical prescriptions have been brought on record. It has thus been submitted that since the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause as enumerated above to prefer the appeal within the time specified the delay in filing of the appeal be condoned.

4. Learned A.C. to A.G. has opposed the limitation application and has submitted that the delay of 1374 days in filing the appeal is an inordinate delay and the appellant has failed to put forward sufficient cause for condonation of the delay.

5. Though there has been a huge delay of 1374 days in preferring the appeal but the factual aspects of the case and the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant clearly reveal a “sufficient cause” for condonation of the delay. The appellant/writ-petitioner is an acid attack victim and the medical prescriptions and the photographs appended to the Memo of Appeal designates the horrific nature of the crime which has led to a disfigurement of the face of the appellant and the perennial nature of the underlying trauma the appellant is experiencing. In cases of this nature delay in filing of the appeal/application should be considered with utmost sympathy and the Courts cannot be oblivious to the psychological distress and physical injury faced by a victim of acid attack. In the context of the present appeal the delay becomes insignificant in the face of the appellant having been traumatized for life.

6. Thus, on a consideration of the reasons advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant for condoning the delay of 1374 days in filing the appeal which we conclude to be sufficient, the delay is accordingly condoned.

7. I.A. No. 2943 of 2026 stands allowed.

L.P.A. No. 252 of 2026

8. This appeal is directed against the order dated 27.11.2019 passed in W.P.(C) No. 2683 of 2018 by the learned Single Judge, whereby and whereunder, the prayer of the appellant to enhance the compensation from Rs. 3,00,000/- to Rs. 25,00,000/- under the Victim Compensation Scheme, 2016 has not been acceded to since the appellant has already received an amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- as compensation.

9. The precursor to the quest of the appellant/writ petitioner for enhanced compensation is an incident which occurred on 31.05.2012 at about 4:00 P.M. wherein while the

appellant was studying in his room his 10-year-old cousin was playing outside the house with another boy of the neighbourhood. There was a quarrel between the children at which the mother of the boy from the locality had arrived and being enraged had started abusing the cousin brother of the appellant. This led to the appellant intervening and forbidding the said woman to use filthy language at which she had rushed back to her house and returned back with a bottle of liquid and threw the liquid on the face of the appellant. The face of the appellant started burning and the appellant started screaming out of the immense pain on account of acid being thrown upon him. On the next day the statement of the appellant was recorded by the Police consequent to which Chano P.S. Case No. 55/2012 was instituted against the accused u/s 307, 326, 304, 506/34 of the IPC.

It has been averred that due to the said incident the face of the appellant was disfigured as the chemical had corroded the face, the eyelids had vanished, both ears have been burnt, the ear cartilage has been lost and severe burns had also affected the neck, chest and left upper limb of the appellant. It has been stated that since the day of the incident the appellant had to undergo several surgeries including plastic surgeries and has to regularly take medicines in which the appellant has incurred an amount exceeding Rs. 25,00,000/-. The appellant had approached for compensation which was not properly entertained at the first instance but on the instruction of the District Legal Services Authority he had received a compensation of an amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- under the Victim Compensation Scheme, 2016. The appellant has spent a huge expenditure on his treatment and he still has to undergo treatment in future and, therefore, for proper treatment and rehabilitation of the appellant it is

necessary that adequate compensation be extended to him. With a prayer for enhanced compensation the appellant had approached this Court by filing a writ application in W.P.(C) No. 2683 of 2018 which however was disposed of on 27.11.2019 by the learned Single Judge without acceding to the prayer of the appellant and which is the order impugned to the present appeal.

10. After giving a factual insight into the case Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, learned counsel for the appellant/writ petitioner has submitted that as on date on account of the heavy dose of medicine and the collateral damage the appellant has been diagnosed with Degenerative Lumbar Spondylitis and needs further corrective treatment for reformation of his face as well as various parts of his body. Learned counsel for the appellant in the background facts and circumstances of the case has formulated the following questions:

- (a)** Whether the appellant can claim compensation more than Rs. 3,00,000/- which is the maximum compensation prescribed for the victims of acid attack under the Jharkhand Victim Compensation Scheme, 2016 ?
- (b)** Whether the respondents are liable to bear the entire medical expenditure of the appellant which is incurred by him towards the treatment of the damage caused to his body and face due to the acid attack ?
- (c)** Whether denying the appellant the compensation and reimbursement of the medical expenses incurred including future expenses required to be incurred in the aforesaid treatment amounts to violation of “Right to Life”

under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and is in violation to the guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court through judicial pronouncements regarding payment of compensation to the victims of acid attack ?

- (d)** Whether the provisions in the notification as submitted by the State regarding compensation to male and female victims is highly discriminatory and unreasonable as well as insufficient to compensate the physical and mental trauma suffered by the victim of both genders ?
- (e)** Whether being a welfare state it was incumbent to operate on the field of “equality” before law and “equal protection of law” with respect to the discriminatory provisions for compensation of male and female victims ?
- (f)** Whether the categorized compensation scheme of the State for male and female victims requires to be revised by including transgenders as well ?
- (g)** Whether an acid attack victim is liable for compensation for mental trauma and distress, psychological damages, family sufferings, social desertion, inability to pursue further education, failure to secure employment due to such disability, losing equality of status and opportunity and

rehabilitation to live an independent and respectable life ?

- (h)** Whether the impugned order dated 27.11.2019 is liable to be set aside for non-consideration of the apparent discrimination with respect to compensation to male and female victims ?

11. Ms. Bhagat, learned counsel for the appellant has by virtue of the questions formulated by her has canvassed a larger picture though confined to the State of Jharkhand. It has been submitted that despite the decision in “*Laxmi v. Union of India*” reported in (2014) 13 SCC 743, the State of Jharkhand has no effective mechanism to regulate the sale, purchase, storage and handling of acid which as the present case would highlight are easily available. It has been submitted that the learned Single Judge did not consider the gender discrimination with respect to the payment of victim compensation though the writ application preferred by the appellant was heard along with the writ application preferred by a female victim. The affidavit submitted by the State reveals about notifications dated 29.09.2016 and 30.07.2019 which evidently makes a discrimination between male and female victims and has not even given a thought for inclusion of transgender. As per Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, the notified compensation scheme of the welfare State are highly discriminatory, unreasonable and an infringement to right to life, right to equal protection of law as enshrined and guaranteed under the Constitution of India. The Schemes of compensation overlooked and neglected the fact that acid attack is a crime against human body irrespective of being male or female or the third gender. The damages, physical

pain, mental distress and trauma, family sufferings, social desertion and other losses are similar to both male and female; also, the treatment of procedure are similar. It has further been submitted that as the acid do not discriminate between a male and female victim while causing damage hence, acid attack is not a crime where there should be any discrimination between male and female or third gender. It is a crime only against the human body and the sufferings end with the death of the victim survivor and, therefore, there should not be any notification giving priority to any gender. All genders deserve equal compensatory provisions covering all losses, damages and harm caused by acid attack. As per Mrs. Bhagat all genders should be treated equally and the State of Jharkhand being a welfare state was duty bound to ensure appropriate notifications eradicating such gender bias. The learned Single Judge has committed an error by confining the appellant to the four corners of the notification for victim compensation and not beyond despite the factual aspects indicating disbursement of a much higher compensation than what has been mentioned in the Victim Compensation Scheme. The actual loss and damages, both mental and physical as well as future losses have not been properly evaluated. It has been pointed out that the impugned order is limited only to the past medical bills of the appellant. There is nothing in the order to compensate the other never-ending losses and damages which continues till the death of the victim which include (a) mental trauma and distress (b) psychological damage (c) family sufferings (d) social desertions by inability to pursue further education (e) generated inequality in employment due to acid attack injury/disability (f) loss of equality of status and opportunity and rehabilitation. That the appellant even after the acid attack has every right to live a respectable and normal life and

every right to carry out his livelihood, social, financial and family duties, right to be treated equally without discrimination and being protected by the Constitution of India for which the Government's Notified Schemes provide no assistance and / or facilities. The impugned order is confined to payment of past medical bills instead of covering actual losses and damages including unseen damages and sufferings which are not physical and for which no bills can be submitted. She has submitted that in cases of acid attack victim/survivor the relief and compensation should automatically cover all these damages apart from the cost of physical harm, medical treatment/surgery bills, for the protection of the right to life of the victim as guaranteed by the Constitution. In the backdrop of such elaborate submissions advanced by Mrs. Bhagat, learned counsel for the appellant she has prayed for setting aside the impugned order dated 27.11.2019 and grant enhanced compensation to the appellant commensurating with the mental and physical trauma being suffered by the appellant.

12. Learned A.C. to A.G. has submitted that the impugned order dated 27.11.2019 has dealt with all aspects of the case and has also directed the appropriate authority to ensure that the appellant gets the required benefits as provided in the notifications to the extent of their applicability on a representation to be submitted by the appellant. Learned counsel has referred to the Jharkhand Victim Compensation (Amendment) Scheme, 2016 which has been notified vide Memo No. 5190 dated 29.09.2016 while submitting that the said notification contains a schedule which provides for compensation payable under various offences. The victim of acid attack will be paid a compensation of Rs. 3,00,000/- which has already been received by the writ-petitioner. It has

been submitted that Clause 2 (घ) of a notification no. 5190 dated 29.09.2016 defines the term victim in a broad and inclusive manner and does not restrict the ambit of the term “victim” on the basis of gender covering all persons who have suffered on account of an offence. It has, therefore, been submitted that since a compensation of Rs. 3,00,000/- has been extended to the writ-petitioner/appellant no interference is necessitated in the impugned order dated 27.11.2019.

13. We have heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and have also perused the affidavits on record.

14. There is no disputation that the writ-petitioner is an acid attack victim and such treacherous attack by the accused upon the writ-petitioner has caused disfigurement of his face and also caused corrosive and burn injuries on various parts of his body. The claim of the writ-petitioner for enhancement of the compensation amount has been negated by the learned Single Judge since he had already received an amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- disbursed through District Legal Services Authority. However, so far as the treatment facilities in terms of the notification dated 30.07.2019 is concerned it has been held that the writ-petitioner is entitled to get the said benefits. From the various affidavits filed, two notifications concerns the present case and these notifications hold centre stage. The first notification is Notification no. 5190 dated 29.09.2016 which is titled Jharkhand Victim Compensation (Amendment) Scheme, 2016. “Victim” in the Scheme of 2016 has been defined in Clause 2 (घ). Clause 5 (ग) of the scheme mandates that the amount of compensation payable to the victim shall be assessed by the District Legal Services Authority based on the loss caused to the victim, the cost incurred in treatment etc. and on consideration of the rehabilitation of the victim. The amount of compensation shall vary depending on the gravity of

the offence and the facts of the case. Sub-Clause (घ) of Clause 5 demarcates that the minimum compensation payable to the victim would be as per Schedule-I. Schedule-I appended to the Scheme of 2016 contains the various categories of offences and the corresponding compensation payable to the victims of each of the categories. So far as an acid attack victim is concerned, the minimum payable amount as per the Scheme of 2016 is Rs. 3,00,000/-. A bare perusal of the provisions contained in the Scheme of 2016 and its Schedule clearly demonstrates that there is no upper limit for compensation to be so awarded. Though a compensation amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- has been disbursed to the writ-petitioner by the District Legal Services Authority but the same does not put fetters on the Court to extend a higher compensation if the facts and circumstances of the case so demand.

15. Another notification has been issued vide notification no. 4052 dated 30.07.2019 based on the Scheme formulated by the National Legal Services Authority consequent to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "*Nipun Saxena & Anr. vs. Union of India & Ors.*" (WPC No. 565 of 2012), wherein the State Government has come out with the Jharkhand Victim Compensation (Amendment) Scheme, 2019. This scheme is confined to female victims and Schedule-II of the said scheme demarcates the compensation amount based on the nature of crime the victim was faced with. Serial No. 13 of Schedule-II of the said scheme reads as under:

Sl. No.	Particulars of loss or injury	Minimum Limit of Compensation	Upper Limit of Compensation
13	Victims of Acid attack		
a.	In case of disfigurement of face	Rs. 7 Lakh	Rs. 8 Lakh
b.	In case of injury more than 50%	Rs. 5 Lakh	Rs. 8 Lakh

c.	In case of injury less than 50%	Rs. 3 Lakh	Rs. 5 Lakh
d.	In case of injury less than 20%	Rs. 3 Lakh	Rs. 4 Lakh

16. Serial 13 of Schedule-II quoted above deals with victims of acid attack and various sub categories have been fixed with variance in compensation depending on the degree of injury suffered. In case of disfigurement of face the minimum limit of compensation is Rs. 7 Lakhs while the upper limit of compensation is Rs. 8 Lakhs. In the scheme an embargo has been put with respect to the maximum compensation which is payable to a victim unlike the Scheme of 2016 which does not put a cap on the limits of compensation. Though the maximum compensation of the Scheme of 2016 has not been fixed, but at the same time, we cannot be oblivious to the fact that the minimum compensation as in the Scheme of 2016 is at wide variance to the minimum compensation fixed for female victims in the Scheme of 2019. A decade has passed since the Scheme of 2016 was unveiled and it is time to consider amendment to the amount of compensation fixed in various categories in the said scheme to commensurate with the Scheme of 2019, especially for male victims in order to obliterate the discrimination it accentuates.

17. Even if we confine ourselves to the Scheme of 2016 and at the cost of repetition what is glaring is the absence of any upper limit in the amount payable to a victim as compensation.

18. In the context of the aforesaid notification Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, learned counsel for the writ-petitioner/appellant has referred to the case of **“Parivartan Kendra Vs. Union of India”** reported in **(2016) 3 SCC 571**, wherein it has been held as follows:

“19. *The guidelines issued by orders in Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2014) 4 SCC 427 : (2014) 4 SCC (Cri) 802] , [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2014) 13 SCC 743 : (2014) 5 SCC (Cri) 814] , [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2016) 3 SCC 669 : (2015) 5 Scale 77] are proper, except with respect to the compensation amount. We just need to ensure that these guidelines are implemented properly. Keeping in view the impact of acid attack on the victim's social, economical and personal life, we need to enhance the amount of compensation. We cannot be oblivious of the fact that the victim of acid attack requires permanent treatment for the damaged skin. The mere amount of Rs 3 lakhs will not be of any help to such a victim. We are conscious of the fact that enhancement of the compensation amount will be an additional burden on the State. But prevention of such a crime is the responsibility of the State and the liability to pay the enhanced compensation will be of the State. The enhancement of the compensation will act in two ways:*

- (i) It will help the victim in rehabilitation;*
- (ii) It will also make the State to implement the guidelines properly as the State will try to comply with it in its true spirit so that the crime of acid attack can be prevented in future.*

21. *In peculiar facts of the case, we are of the view that victim Chanchal deserves to be awarded a compensation more than what has been prescribed by this Court in Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2014) 4 SCC 427 : (2014) 4 SCC (Cri) 802] . Though in this case we are not issuing any guidelines different from the guidelines issued in Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2014) 4 SCC 427 : (2014) 4 SCC (Cri) 802] , we should not forget that the younger sister was also injured by the acid attack. Although her degree of sufferance is not as that of the elder one, but she also requires treatment and rehabilitation. It is to be noted that this Court in Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2016) 3 SCC 669 : (2015) 5 Scale 77] does not put a bar on the Government to award compensation limited to Rs 3 lakhs. The State has the discretion to provide more compensation to the victim in the case of acid attack as per Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2016) 3 SCC 669 : (2015) 5 Scale 77] guidelines. It is*

also to be noticed that this Court has not put any condition in Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2016) 3 SCC 669 : (2015) 5 Scale 77] as to the degree of injuries which a victim has suffered due to acid attack. In the instant case, the victim's father has already spent more than Rs 5 lakhs for the treatment of the victim. In consideration of the severity of the victim's injury, expenditure with regard to grafting and reconstruction surgery, physical and mental pain, etc., we are of the opinion that the victim (Chanchal) should be compensated to a tune of at least Rs 10 lakhs. Suffice it to say that the compensation must not only be awarded in terms of the physical injury, we have also to take note of the victim's inability to lead a full life and to enjoy those amenities which is being robbed of her as a result of the acid attack. Therefore, this Court deems it proper to award a compensation of Rs 10 lakhs and accordingly, we direct the Government concerned to compensate the victim Chanchal to the tune of Rs 10 lakhs, and in light of the judgment given in Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2016) 3 SCC 669 : (2015) 5 Scale 77] we direct the State Government of Bihar concerned to compensate the main victim's sister, Sonam to a tune of Rs 3 lakhs. Of the total amount of Rs 13 lakhs, a sum of Rs 5 lakhs shall be paid to the victim and her family within a period of one month and the remaining sum of Rs 8 lakhs shall be paid to the victims within a period of three months from the date of this order. Furthermore, the State shall upon itself take full responsibility for the treatment and rehabilitation of the victims of acid attack as per the guidelines provided in Laxmi case [Laxmi v. Union of India, (2016) 3 SCC 669 : (2015) 5 Scale 77], vide order dated 10-4-2015.”

19. The writ-petitioner as we have noticed above had suffered disfigurement of his face to such an extent that even after multiple surgeries his face reveals the physical deformities an acid attack victim undergoes; the photographs brought on record being a testament to such fact. What, however, cannot be fathomed is the immense pain, suffering and mental trauma the writ-petitioner must have undergone

and is still undergoing. We are aware of the fact that the physical and mental pain and suffering cannot be compensated in terms of money but it is our belief that the same would go a long way in alleviating to a certain extent such trauma and may also assist the writ-petitioner in his rehabilitation. The writ-petitioner as stated by Mrs. Bhagat, was pursuing his Chartered Accountancy Course and a bright future beckoned but all the dreams, aspirations and goals of the writ-petitioner have been scuttled by virtue of a moment of rage at the hands of the accused.

20. On the basis of the overall facts and circumstances discussed above and since Rs. 3,00,000/- extended as victim compensation is a meagre amount and the fact that there is no upper limit provided for payment of compensation in the Scheme of 2016, we enhance the amount of compensation to **Rs. 15,00,000/- (Rs. Fifteen Lakhs)** payable to the writ-petitioner.

21. Since, admittedly the writ-petitioner has received an amount of **Rs. 3,00,000/- (Rs. Three Lakhs)** the balance amount of compensation of **Rs. 12,00,000/- (Rs. Twelve Lakhs)** shall be extended to him within a period of **eight weeks** from the date of receipt / production of a copy of this order.

22. We now venture into the field, the parameters of which demarcate the cost incurred in the treatment of the writ-petitioner and the future cost. The writ-petitioner had preferred a contempt application being Contempt Case (Civil) No. 133 of 2022 which was disposed of on 18.11.2022 since an amount of Rs. 4,21,197/- had been paid towards the medical expenses incurred by the writ-petitioner out of the claimed amount of Rs. 18,21,588/-. The show cause filed in the contempt application spells out the reasons for not making

payment of the entire amount claimed. Certain discrepancies have been pointed out in the said show cause of some bills. If the respondents feel that some bills require clarification an immediate response should be sought for from the writ-petitioner and once the queries are clarified there should not be any impediment for the concerned respondents to expedite the process of payment. Out of the amount claimed of Rs. 18,21,588/- an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- has been claimed as future compensation which has been negated by the State-respondent and rightly so as the expenses which are to be reimbursed by the concerned Department should be the actual expenses incurred. However, as regards the balance of the expenditure concerned minus the amount which has already been received by the writ-petitioner the rest amount should be released in favour of the writ-petitioner expeditiously and preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt / production of a copy of this order provided the writ-petitioner submits the necessary vouchers, bills etc. if, not already submitted. Since the writ-petitioner requires further corrective surgery he has to incur a huge expenditure. Once on incurring the recurrent expenditure the writ-petitioner submits the bills, the concerned respondent shall process the same expeditiously keeping in mind that the writ-petitioner is an acid attack survivor and shall thereafter make the payment to the writ-petitioner. In case the expenses for the treatment are payable to the Hospital the concerned respondent shall endeavour to directly make payment to the Hospital once the bills are submitted before him which is one of the processes being adopted to make payment of an amount of Rs. 7,29,266/- minus an amount of Rs. 4,21,197/- which has already been paid as could be deciphered from the show cause filed in Contempt Case (Civil) No. 133 of 2022.

23. As a consequence, to the discussions made hereinabove this Letters Patent Appeal stands disposed of with the aforementioned observations and directions.

24. Pending Interlocutory Application, if any, stands closed.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Dated, the 19th June, 2026
A. Sanga/-
Uploaded on 24/06/2026