

\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 8489/2018

SMT. RAMUNI PANDEY THROUGH AUTHORISED
REPRESENTATIVE

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Amit and Mr Shio Kumar,
Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC
with Mr Pradeep Jha, Advocate for R-
1 to R-4/UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

14.08.2018

CM No.32617/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 8489/2018

2. The petitioner claims to be the widow of Late Shri Jaya Dev Pandey. It is stated that Shri Jaya Dev Pandey was veteran freedom fighter and was actively involved in the struggle for India's independence. The petitioner also states that Shri Jaya Dev Pandey was incarcerated in Sakchi Sub Jail, Purulia District Jail and subsequently at Patna Camp Jail, Patna. He was released on 11.01.1943 and, thereafter, went underground in view of his activities relating to the independence movement of this country.

3. It is stated that on 30.07.1981, Shri Jaya Dev Pandey made an application for pension under the Swatantrata Sainik Samman Pension

Scheme, 1980. He subsequently expired on 28.02.1983. Subsequently, the petitioner (being the widow of Shri Jaya Dev Pandey) also filed an application dated 18.12.1989 requesting for pension under the said scheme. The petitioner states that this was in continuation of the earlier application filed by Shri Jaya Dev Pandey.

4. The petitioner states that she has lost all original papers but has retained photocopies thereof. Her grievance is that she has not been granted any pension under the said scheme and is not aware of the status of the applications made by her or her late husband.

5. More than three decades have passed since the petitioner had made the application in question. Admittedly, the recommendation/verification for pension under the Swatantrata Sainik Samman Pension Scheme, 1980 has to be made by the concerned State Government. In the present case, the concerned authorities of the State of Jharkhand (which was formed after the petitioner had made the application in question) has informed the petitioner that they have no information relating to her application.

6. In the aforesaid view, the petition is disposed of by directing respondent no.1 to examine the averments made in the present petition and inform the petitioner as to the status of her application. The respondent shall also examine whether the said application can be processed on the basis of photocopies of the documents, which are annexed with the present petition.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

AUGUST 14, 2018
MK