

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 26376 of 2014
DECIDED ON: NOVEMBER 30, 2017

JITA RANI

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

BANK OF BARODA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. R.K. Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.B. Bagga, Advocate,
for the respondents.

JASPAL SINGH, J.

Instant petition has been preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India by the petitioner seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the action of the respondents in not releasing the medical reimbursement in respect of her deceased husband late Sh. Sat Paul Sangra, Head Cashier as well as not releasing the financial aid in terms of the scheme of bank "Grant of Financial Aid to the family of the employee dying in harness" and further quashing the order dated 19.03.2013 (P-8) whereby application of the petitioner for the release of financial relief in lieu of employment to the dependent on compassionate ground has been declined.

2. In short, the petitioner has claimed twin-fold relief through instant petition i.e. for the reimbursement of medical claim and grant of financial aid

under the aforesaid scheme after quashing of order dated 19.03.2013.

3. As far as the grant/payment of medical reimbursement in respect of her deceased husband Sh. Sat Paul Sangra, is concerned, during the pendency of present petition, the petitioner was advised to approach the Chief Manager (HR), Bank of Baroda, Regional Office, Jalandhar to verify the matter as to why there is a difference in the amount of bills etc. and ultimately, it emerged that no medical bills were submitted or pending with the respondents for the reimbursement of the medical claim regarding which, the alleged in action on the part of the respondents was claimed and it was only, thereafter, the photocopies of the various bills were presented to the respondents. The reference of which finds mentioned in the minutes of meeting dated 15.11.2017. The copy of which has been furnished today by learned counsel for the respondents.

4. Accordingly, the instant petition qua the relief of medical claim is disposed of with the direction to the respondents to consider and take a conscious decision with regard to the medical claim of the petitioner and make the payment of the amount to which the petitioner is entitled, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

5. As far as grant of financial aid under the aforesaid scheme is concerned, it would be suffice to mention that the petitioner has already been granted the family pension on account of untimely demise of her husband. In addition to it, her son has also been provided employment under the aforesaid scheme. As per the conditions laid down in the aforesaid scheme, ex-gratia can only be granted to the family of the employee, where the income of the family is

less than 60% of the last drawn/payable monthly gross salary of the employee. Letter furnished by learned counsel for the respondents as “Annexure A” suggests that the petitioner is getting pension to the tune of ₹12,905/- per month whereas her son, who has been provided employment under the aforesaid scheme on compassionate ground is drawing salary to the tune of ₹17,300/- per month and, as such, the income of the family exceeds more than 60% of the last salary drawn by the deceased. Thus, vide letter dated 19.06.2013 (P-8), the relief with regard to the financial aid has rightly been declined by the respondents. As such, it does not call for any interference. Thus, the petitioner is not entitled to the relief claimed in this regard and the petition merits dismissal qua this relief.

NOVEMBER 30, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***