

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 9675 OF 2016

Nandini Rakesh Pawar & Anr. .. Petitioners

Versus

The Union of India & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr.Vishnu B. Madan, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mrs.D.S. Ansingkar (Jape), Standing Counsel for
respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA &
S.M.GAVHANE, JJ.**

DATED : 15.11.2017

P.C. :-

1. It is submitted by learned Counsel for the petitioners that deceased Rakesh Pawar was in employment of respondent No.2. While in service he expired. Widow is entitled to receive family pension. However, widow and mother have settled the matter and the widow has agreed that amount of family pension be received by mother i.e. petitioner No.2.

2. Learned Advocate for the respondent submits that family pension can only be payable to the widow as per Rule 54 of the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules.

3. As per rules, naturally, the pension is payable to the widow and in the said rules we do not find mother to be beneficiary of the pension. Be that as it may, the matter is settled between petitioner Nos.1 and 2. The petitioner No.1 shall give bank account number wherein the pension payable to widow shall be deposited. The respondent shall deposit said pension in the bank account as would be suggested by the widow.

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

[S.M.GAVHANE, J.]

[S.V.GANGAPURWALA, J.]