

WPA 16394 of 2017

Gulshan Kumar Khanna
Vs.
Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Subrata Bhattacharya,
Ms. Soma Roy Chowdhury,
...for the petitioner.
...for the LIC.

The grievance of the petitioner is directed against the refusal of the respondent/LICI to pay the petitioner.

Heard the petitioner. The respondent/ Corporation is represented.

It appears from a letter dated 26th June, 2016 (Annexure P/5 at page 51 of the petition) that the petitioner was directed by the Life Insurance Corporation to approach the Central Office Claim Dispute Redressal Committee.

The petitioner relies on a letter dated 2nd September, 2016 to contend that he has approached the appropriate committee. This fact has refuted by the counsel on behalf of the LIC.

It is submitted on behalf of the LIC that no appeal or representation has been made to the Central Office Claim Dispute Redressal Committee.

In view of the alternative remedy available to the petitioner, the petitioner is directed to approach the

committee by filing a fresh representation within a period of two weeks from date. If such representation is received by the committee, the committee will dispose of the same within four weeks thereafter.

I make it clear that I have not gone into the merits of the case and nothing on the merits of this case will be binding on the Central Office Claim Dispute Redressal Committee which will hear the petitioner and pass a reasoned order in disposing of the representation of the petitioner.

With the aforesaid directions, WPA 16394 of 2017 is disposed off. However, there will be no order as to costs.

(Ravi Krishan Kapur, J.)