

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

WP(C)No. 21 of 2026

Sri Bijoy Kumar Lodh, S/o- Lt. Dharani Kanta Lodh, R/o- Flat No.- 2E, Mallahar Apartment, 27/1 Shyamnagar Road, South Dumdum(M) North 24 Paraganas, P.O.- Bangur, P.S.-Dumdum, Dist-North 24 Paraganas, Pin-700055.

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

- 1.**The State of Tripura**, represented by its Secretary, Govt. of Tripura, Handloom, Handicrafts and Sericulture, P.O- Agartala, District-West Tripura.
- 2.**The Secretary**, Govt. of Tripura, Handloom, Handicrafts and Sericulture, P.O- Agartala, District- West Tripura.
- 3.**The Director of Handloom, Handicrafts and Sericulture**, Agartala, West Tripura, Pin-799006.
- 4.**The General Manager**, State Bank of India, North Eastern Circle (Local Head Office) GS Road, Opposite Assam Sachivalaya, Dispur, Sarumotoria, Guwahati- 781006, Assam.
- 5.**The Assistant General Manager**, State Bank of India, Centralized Pension Processing Center, Guwahati, Kamrup Metro, Assam, Chilarai Nagar, Pin-781007.
- 6.**The Branch Manager, State Bank of India**, Agartala branch, HGB Road, Agartala, West Tripura, Pin-799001.
- 7.**The Manager Branch**, State Bank of India, Agartala Branch, Pension Cell, Agartala, West Tripura, Pin-799001.
- 8.**The Accountant General (A&E)**, Tripura, Agartala, P.O- Kunjaban, Pin-799006,

....Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Ms. Sujata Deb(Gupta), Advocate. Mr. Ramprasad Gope, Advocate.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. P.Gautam, Sr. GA. Mr. Debalay Bhattacharya, Sr.Advocate. Mr. Amrit Lal Saha, Advocate.
Date of hearing & Delivery of Judgment/ Order.	:	16.03.2026.

Whether fit for reporting :

Yes	No.
	✓



=B=E=F=O=R=E=

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. DATTA PURKAYASTHA

Judgment and Order (Oral)

Heard Ld. Counsel of both sides.

[2] No Counter Affidavit is submitted by the State Bank of India [Respondent No.7], though sufficient opportunity was given to them to submit the same. Therefore, the scope of filing the Counter Affidavit is closed.

[3] The case of the petitioner in brief is that his wife, namely, Late Manju Rani Nandi was working in the Handloom, Handicraft & Sericulture Department, Government of Tripura as Lower Division Clerk(LDC) and she went on retirement on 31.01.1998. Thereafter, she was regularly drawing her pension. The PPO issued by the Office of the Accountant General (A&E) [Annexure- 2] duly reflects the name of the petitioner, Bijay Kumar Lodh as her husband.

[4] Said Manju Rani Nandi died on 29.01.2025 at ILS Hospital, Dumdum and Death Certificate was also duly issued by the Registrar (Birth & Death), Municipality, Dumdum, West Bengal vide Annexure-4. Thereafter, the petitioner sent a letter dated 19.02.2025 to Respondent No.6 [Annexure-6], seeking Family Pension on account of death of his wife. In reply thereto, Respondent No.7 sent a letter to him on 03.03.2025[Annexure-7] asking him to resubmit the prayer for such Family Pension along with the following documents:

1. Family Pension application form (all pages) and photocopy of the attached documents verified by the SBI Branch Official with SS No.
2. All the photocopies of documents signed by family pensioner including Death Certificate.
3. 2nd page of the PPO to be attached and signed by the family pensioner.
4. Life certificate form not duly filled up.

[5] According to the petitioner, he, thereafter, submitted all the required documents on 17.03.2025, vide Annexure-8 to Respondent No.6, but, till date, no family pension has been provided to him, though, 1 year has elapsed. On 22.05.2025, the petitioner also submitted another letter to Respondent No.4 by enclosing one affidavit that said Manju Rani Nandi, after her marriage, adopted the surname of her husband i.e. 'Lodh' and accordingly she changed her name from 'Manju Rani Nandi' to 'Manju Rani Lodh', but, as no response was received from the SBI authority, he also sent one Advocate Notice on 01.07.2025 [Annexure-10] to Respondent No.6, which also went un-responded till date. With such allegations, he has filed the present writ petition with the following reliefs:

"i. Admit the petition;

ii. Call for the records from the custody of the respondents;

ii. Issue rule as to why a writ of Mandamus shall not be issued directing the Respondents to release family pension immediately and to pay all admissible benefits.

iv. Issue rule as to why a writ of Mandamus shall not be issued directing the Respondents to release the family pension and all arrear pension in accordance with the provision of law forthwith.

v. Issue rule as to why a writ of Mandamus shall not be issued directing the Respondents to consider the representation dated 19.02.2025 submitted by the petitioner.

vi. After hearing the parties, to make the Rule (iii), (iv) & (v) Absolute in terms of prayers made;

vii. Costs incidental to this proceeding;

viii. Any other relief(s) as to this Hon'ble High Court may deem fit and proper;....."

[6] Ld. Counsel Smt. Sujata Deb(Gupta), referring to all documents submits that despite all the codal formalities were completed by the petitioner long ago, the matter has been kept pending by SBI authority for one year to the serious prejudice and harassment of the petitioner.

[7] Ld. Sr. GA, Mr. P. Gautam submits that the entire matter is to be scrutinized by SBI authority and necessary steps were/are required to be taken by them. Ld. Sr. GA also submits that the parent Department, where said Manju Rani served, has no further duties or function in this regard.

[8] Ld. Sr. Counsel, Mr. Debalay Bhattacharya representing the Office of the Accountant General (A&E) submits that at this stage the Office of the Accountant General (A&E) has no role to play. Ld. Sr. Counsel also submits that as per procedure, the Bank is required to forward the matter to the parent Department where Manju Rani Nandi had worked and thereafter, said Department, on scrutiny, would refer the matter to the Office of the Accountant General (A&E) for final approval.

[9] Ld. Counsel Mr. Amrit Lal Saha submits that so far instruction is received from his client, after the application was submitted by the petitioner on 17.03.2025, [Annexure-8] with required documents, the matter was sent to the Regional Office of State Bank of India at Guwahati which is the Centralized Pension Processing Centre, but, thereafter, no further instruction is received by Ld. Counsel as to whether same was sent to the parent Department or not.

[10] The Court has perused the documents submitted by the petitioner and also has considered the pleadings of the respondents and the submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides.

[11] The PPO as was issued from the Office of the Accountant General clearly depicts the name of the present petitioner as husband of said Manju Rani Nandi and therefore, there is no confusion about the status of the petitioner that he is the husband of deceased employee and being husband of the deceased, he is therefore entitled to get the family pension. It also reveals that the petitioner submitted letter to the Branch Manager, State Bank of India [Respondent No.6] along with required documents as were asked for by them long ago, and there is also no denial from the side of Bank authority that they did not receive the same.

[12] In such a situation, it appears that for a long period the matter has been kept pending by the Bank authority without further processing the matter, depriving the petitioner from getting his legitimate right to receive said family pension.

[13] In view of the above, the writ petition is allowed.

[14] Respondent Nos. 4 to 7 are directed to immediately process the petition for family pension of the petitioner, and if same is required to be sent to the parent Department of the deceased, that should be done within 2 weeks positively. The parent Department i.e. Respondent Nos.1, 2 and 3, on receipt of such application, if so forwarded, will clear up the matter within next 1 week and the Office of Accountant General(A&E) will also in their turn clear up the matter thereafter within further 1 week, if the same is forwarded to them. Respondents are directed to ensure that the petitioner receives the family pension within 4 weeks of receipt of copy of this Judgment by the respondents.

For delay caused by the Bank authority, without any explanation in this matter, a cost of Rs.10,000/- is imposed on them and the amount shall be paid to the petitioner.

Ld. Counsel, Mr. A. Saha earnestly prays for not imposing any cost upon the Bank authority but such request is not accepted for the reason that for sitting over the matter idle for about one year by Bank authority, it has caused undue sufferance and harassment to the petitioner.

With such observations and directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

Interim application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE