

\$~10

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(C) 7995/2018 & C.M.No.33730/2018 (for exemption from personal hearing)

SUSHILA DEVI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.A.K.Trivedi with Mr.Naveen Kumar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondent

Through Mr.J.K.Singh, S.C. with Mr.Harsh Pandit, Ms.Madhulika Agarwal, Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI**

**ORDER**

%

**21.08.2018**

1. Mr.J.K.Singh, learned counsel for the respondents states that contrary to the submissions made by the petitioner in the present petition to the effect that the respondents have not responded to the letter dated 28.12.2016, addressed by the Railway Protection Special Force (RPSF) to the CPO (Hqtr.), Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi on the issue of the petitioner's entitlement to family pension, on the demise of her mother, Smt.Sushila Devi in the year 2014, he has instruction to state that vide letter dated 27.06.2016 the respondents had already informed the RPSF that family pension could not be released in favour of the petitioner in the absence of any  
*W.P.(C) 7995/2018*

*page 1 of 3*

documentary proof produced by her to establish her dependency on her parents.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents states that in any event, a recent letter dated 17.08.2018 has been addressed by the Northern Railways to RPSF stating *inter alia* that till necessary clarifications are given by the petitioner with regard to the documentary proof of dependency by furnishing the requisite documents, her request for release of family pension cannot be processed. He further states that the respondents had also intimated the petitioner about the rejection of her case, vide letter dated 29.06.2016, despatched to her at her matrimonial address.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after the demise of her husband in the year 1991, the petitioner had been residing with her parents for several years and she had been corresponding with the respondents from the said address.

4. The said submission is however, not borne out from the record produced by learned counsel for the respondents, which reveals that the petitioner had been corresponding with the respondents from her matrimonial address as well. Therefore, the respondents cannot be blamed for replying to the petitioner at her matrimonial address.

5. Be that as it may, to cut short the entire controversy, it is deemed appropriate to direct the respondents to furnish a list of the documents required from the petitioner for processing her claim for grant of family pension, to the counsel for the petitioner within one week from today. On the said list being furnished to the counsel for

the petitioner, the petitioner shall produce the documents before the CPO, Hqtrs, Northern Railways, Baroda House, New Delhi within four weeks. As and when the said documents are submitted by the petitioner, the respondents shall process her claim and if she is found entitled to family pension as per law, the same shall be released in her favour within eight weeks, from the date of her submitting the relevant documents.

6. The petition is disposed of alongwith pending application.

**HIMA KOHLI, J**

**REKHA PALLI, J**

**AUGUST 21, 2018/sr**