

\$~20

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 5106/2021

SHIVLEEN PASRICHA ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Amresh Anand, Advocate along  
with petitioner in person  
versus

STATE (NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI)  
& ANR. .... Respondents  
Through Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC with  
Ms. Ayushi Bansal, Advocate for  
R-1&2

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH**

**ORDER**

%

**31.05.2021**

Proceedings have been conducted through video conferencing.

1. This public interest litigation has been preferred for the following reliefs :-

*“(a) Issue appropriate writ(s), order(s) and/ or direction(s) in the nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate nature, directing the Respondents to take appropriate steps to regulate/ cap the rate of High-Resolution Computerised Tomography ('HRCT') test/ scan in the State of National Capital Territory of Delhi, specifically for patients having COVID-19 symptoms, in the interest of justice; and*

*(b) Pass any other and/ or further necessary order(s) and/ or direction(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, proper and necessary, in the interest of justice.”*

2. Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner submits that the price / rate of the High-Resolution Computerised Tomography Test (hereinafter referred as '**HRCT Test**') has been recently capped in the Government hospitals at Delhi whereas there is no regulation or capping in the private hospitals and the rates are varying from hospital to hospital and are on the higher side. It is also submitted that Notifications have been passed by various States such as States of Maharashtra, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh capping the price of HRCT Test upto Rs.3,000/-. In the States of Karnataka and Bihar rates have been regulated and capped even in the private hospitals. Learned counsel therefore submits that suffice would it be for the disposal of this writ petition that the concerned Respondent authorities are directed to treat the present petition as a representation and decide the same at the earliest.

3. In view of this limited submission by the petitioner, this writ petition is disposed of with direction to the concerned Respondent Authorities to treat this petition as a representation and decide the same in accordance with law, rules, regulations and Government policies, applicable to the facts of the case and also keeping in mind that similar actions have been taken in many States in the country, both in Government and private hospitals.

4. With these observations, the writ petition is hereby disposed of.

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**JYOTI SINGH, J**

**MAY 31, 2021/rk**