

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

22 WRIT PETITION NO.762 OF 2021

Vidya Yogesh Bava

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra and Others

.. Respondents

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Pravin V. Suryawanshi

AGP for Respondent / State : Mrs. M.A. Deshpande

Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 to 4 : Mr. P.S. Patil

...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, JJ.**

DATE : 25-07-2022

PER COURT :

1. An employee of the respondent - Zilla Parishad, who happened to be the petitioner's husband died and her request for family pension is stated to be under consideration.

2. The learned Advocate for respondent no.3 submits that the mother-in-law of the petitioner is raising an objection.

3. The fact that the petitioner happens to be the wife of the deceased employee - Yogesh has not been disputed. It appears that the decision is not being taken on the sole count that her

mother-in-law is objecting. Assuming for the sake of arguments and without commenting upon the right of the mother-in-law to raise an objection, it was imperative for respondent no.3 to take some decision and pass appropriate order. It is unfortunate that the widow's claim has been kept lingering for few years even when couple of children depend on her.

4. We consider it appropriate to direct the respondent no.3 to pass suitable orders on its own merits on the request of the petitioner for family pension.

5. Writ Petition is allowed in terms of prayer clauses 'B' and 'C'. The decision shall be taken within three months.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)