

244

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

**Civil Revision No.2811 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.02.2019**

**STATE OF PUNJAB THROUGH SECRETARY STATE OF
PUNJAB CHANDIGARH**

.....Petitioner

Vs

SMT MURTI DEVI AND OTHERS

....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present:Mr. Arun Kaundal, D.A.G., Punjab
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate
for respondents No.1 to 3.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

[1]. This revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 04.09.2014 passed by the District Judge, Jind.

[2]. There is delay of 1221 days in filing the present revision petition. Notice in the application for condonation of delay was issued on 08.05.2018.

[3]. The reply has been filed on behalf of the respondents No.1 to 3 and the same is taken on record.

[4]. It appears from the record that on account of settlement arrived between the parties in respect of family pension of

deceased Chamela Singh, mode of utilization has been settled between the parties.

[5]. In view of order dated 04.09.2014 passed by the District Judge, Jind, family pension of deceased Chemela Singh shall be disbursed to plaintiffs No.2 and 3 namely Tushar and Tanish in equal shares. The legal heirs of Smt. Dhan Kaur namely Smt. Krishna, Smt. Santosh and plaintiff No.1 shall not claim any right qua family pension of deceased Chamela Singh. Retiral benefits of Chamela Singh had already been disbursed to late Smt. Dhan Kaur. The said order was passed in view of understanding arrived at between the contesting parties.

[6]. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

[7]. It is not the case of the petitioner that Chamela Singh was not entitled to any family pension. The mode of utilization of family pension amongst the heirs has already been settled by them by way of amicable resolution. The State cannot be a necessary party in such resolution of dispute.

[8]. The filing of the present revision petition at such a belated stage is found to be misconceived. There is no sufficient ground to condone the delay in filing this petition, nor any merit is found in the same.

[9]. In view of above, the application for condonation of

delay along with the revision petition is hereby dismissed.

Normal consequences to follow. All other misc. applications are also accordingly disposed of.

February 06, 2019

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No