

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

**CWP No. 18353 of 2014
Date of decision: November 30,2015**

Bimla Devi
Versus
State of Haryana and ors.
...Petitioner
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

--

Present: - Mr. Ajay Vijarana, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. D.K. Mittal, DAG, Haryana
for respondent no.1,3 and 4
Mr. Sanjeev Kodar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

-

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

In the year 2006, the Government of Haryana had introduced an insurance scheme namely Rajiv Gandhi Parivar Bima Yojna (in short 'Scheme') to grant immediate financial assistance to the families of those who died untimely in an accidental death. To implement the Scheme, the Government of Haryana has covered all the residents of the State and entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with respondent No.2. As per the Scheme in case of untimely death of a person between the age of 18 to 60 years, who is resident of Haryana, the family of the deceased would be entitled to get compensation of Rs.1,00,000/-.

The husband of the petitioner namely Ishwar Singh, aged about 45 years, died on 9.7.2008 due to drowning in a pond. The petitioner submitted her application claiming compensation under the Scheme alongwith required documents

in the office of respondent No.4, who after proper verification sent the same to respondent No.2 on 3.10.2011 for disbursing the claim amount of Rs.1,00,000/-to the petitioner.

As the said amount was not released to her, she filed the instant writ petition.

In the reply submitted on behalf of respondents No.1,3 and 4, it has been stated that after verification of the documents, submitted by the petitioner, application of the petitioner for awarding compensation was forwarded to respondent No.2 on 3.10.2011.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2, on the other hand, contends that the said application was never received by respondent No.2 and it is only after issuance of notice of motion, respondent No.2 became aware of the claim of the petitioner. It was immediately processed and a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- was released in favour of the petitioner. In this regard, learned counsel for respondent No.2 has handed over a cheque to learned counsel for the petitioner today in the Court, a copy of which is placed on the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner prays that since the amount has been released in favour of the petitioner, after a long delay, so she is entitled to interest thereon.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2 states that there is no delay in releasing the amount in favour of the petitioner as there was no communication received with regard to disbursing of the amount in question from respondent No.4.

CWP No. 18353 of 2014 -3-

Without going into the contention aforesaid, the fact remains that the claim of the petitioner has been satisfied only after a delay of four years. The petitioner, who is a poor widow, has been forced to litigate for release of the amount to which, she is entitled under the Scheme.

Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to pay an amount of Rs.15,000/- to the petitioner as costs.

(Harinder Singh Sidhu)
Judge

30.11.2015
dinesh