



Serial No. 11
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 172 of 2025

Date of Decision: 27.11.2025

Smti Chandrabala Koch,
W/o (L) Sochindra Koch @ Suchindra Koch,
R/o Manjuri, P.O Borkona,
P.S. Mankachar, South Salmara Mankachar, Assam,
Present Address:
Village-Basbari, P.O. Monabari,
South West Garo Hills District, Meghalaya

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Meghalaya represented by
The Commissioner & Secretary, C&RD Department,
Govt. of Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya,
Finance (Pension Cell) Department, Shillong
3. The Deputy Commissioner,
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya
4. The Block Development Officer,
Selsella C&RD Block,
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya
5. The Treasury Officer,
Tura District Treasury
West Garo Hills, Meghalaya
6. The Principal Accountant General (A&E),
Meghalaya, Shillong.

... Respondent(s)



Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice H. S. Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. S.A. Sheikh, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. R. Colney, GA with
Mr. A.M. Pala, GA (For R 1-5)
Ms. E.B. Passah, Adv. (For R 6)

i)	Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc:	Yes/No
----	--	--------

ii)	Whether approved for publication in press:	Yes/No
-----	---	--------

JDUGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. The writ petitioner is before this Court for directions to release the family pension of her (L) husband Shri Sochindra Koch, who was serving as a Gram Sevak under the C&RD Department.

2. Mr. S.A. Sheikh, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impediment for granting of the family pension was due to the fact that the name of the petitioner, who is the wife was not entered in the pension paper, whereas the names of the children are shown therein. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has since obtained the Next of Kin Certificate certifying the fact that she is the wife of the deceased



employee, and as such there should be no further hindrance for release of the family pension.

3. Ms. R. Colney, learned GA for the respondents Nos. 1 to 5, submits that as the objections had arisen from the respondent No. 6 (Accountant General), perhaps the matter can be disposed of, as the same has been rectified.

4. Ms. E.B. Passah, learned counsel for the respondent No. 6, (Accountant General), also acceded to the submissions and submits that it is correct that the pension was not released due to the non-inclusion of the wife's name, and in this regard the respondent No. 6, had taken the matter up with the State respondents for verification.

5. This Court notes as seen from the affidavit of the respondent No. 6, that though the names of the children have been incorporated in the pension payment order, the name of the petitioner was not included in view of the fact that her name was not shown at the time of submission of the said paper. On the production of the Next of Kin Certificate dated 16.08.2025, by the learned counsel for the petitioner, which is taken on record, it thus appears that the impediment no longer exists, and as such, the family pension can be released in accordance with law.



6. Accordingly, this matter is disposed of with the directions that the respondent No. 6, and the State respondents process the release of the family pension within a period of 2(two) months, from the date of this order.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
27.11.2025
"V. Lyndem-PS"