



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.04.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

W.P.NO.9636 OF 2022

AND

W.M.P.NO.9377 OF 2022

S.Snehaa

... Petitioner/
Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Manager (E & OS),
M/s.Life Insurance Corporation
of India,
Chennai Divisional Office,
C-47, II Avenue,
Anna Nagar Plaza, Anna Nagar,
Chennai - 600 040.

2. Jayanthi

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent herein to disburse the petitioner's share in her father's family pension vide pension I.D.No.770100752 on the file of 1st respondent, the forthwith petitioner representation dated 01.07.2021.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Padmanabhan

ORDER

The relief sought for in the writ petition is for a Mandamus seeking direction to the 1st respondent herein to disburse the petitioner's share in her father's family pension vide pension ID.No.770100752 on the file of 1st respondent, the forthwith petitioner representation dated 01.07.2021.

2. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner's father was a retired employee, who served as



WEB COPY

Development Officer for more than thirty (30) years in the 1st respondent insurance corporation. The petitioner married the 2nd respondent on 01.11.1989 and blessed with two children. The 2nd respondent insisting the petitioner's father to delegate the property rights and title to her and she obtained major portions of the property in her name. Thereafter, the petitioner's father died on 24.04.2021 leaving behind the petitioner, mother of the petitioner and the 2nd respondent and her children as his legal heirs. It is pertinent to note that the petitioner alone perform the funeral ceremonies of the deceased father. Further, the petitioner filed the succession OP before this Court in O.P.D.No.60662 of 2021 for succession certificate, which is pending for numbering. The second respondent approached the first petitioner and applied for pension and other benefits, without adding the names of the petitioner and her mother as legal heirs of the deceased. At this stage, the petitioner came to know that the 1st respondent without any notice to the petitioner, has made ready to disburse the pensionary benefits to the 2nd respondent. Hence, the present writ petition has been filed for the aforesaid prayer.

4. In an identical circumstances, this Court elaborately consider the similar issues related to the payment of pensionary benefits, which has to be adjudicated only by this Court and I have passed an order in W.P.No.2934 of 2010 dated 16.12.2021 (DKKJ). The relevant portion of the said order is extracted as follows.

10. Let this Court considers the decisions with regard to disbursement of terminal benefits of the deceased in case of interse dispute between the nominees and legal heirs.

11. The question whether the nominee appointed under Section 39 of the Life Insurance Act, 1938 gets absolute right to amount due under life insurance policy on death of assured, came up for consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sarabati Devi & Another Vs. Usha Devi (CDJ 1983 SC 144 : 1984 AIR SC 346) wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

"4. At the out set it should be mentioned that except the decision of the Allahabad High Court in Kesari Devi v. Dharma Devi on which reliance was placed by the High Court in dismissing the appeal before it and the two decisions of the Delhi High Court in S. Fauza Singh v. Kuldip Singh & Ors. And Mrs. Uma Sehgal & Anr. v. Dwarka Dass Sehgal & Ors in all other decisions cited before us the view taken is that the nominee



WEB COPY

under section 39 of the Act is nothing more than an agent to receive the money due under a life insurance policy in the circumstances similar to those in the present case and that the money remains the property of the assured during his lifetime and on his death forms part of his estate subject to the law of succession applicable to him. The cases which have taken the above view are Ramballav DhanJhanian v. Gangadhar Nathmall. Life Insurance Corporation of India v. United Bank of India Ltd. & Anr., D. Mohanaeelu Muldaliar & Anr. v. Indian Insurance and Banking Corporation Ltd. Salem & Anr., Sarojini Amma v. Neelakanta Pillai Atmaram Mohanlal Panchal v. Gunavantiben & Ors., Malli Dei and Lakshmi Amma Anr. v. Sagnna Bhagath & Ors., Since there is a conflict of judicial opinion on the question involved in this case it is necessary to examine the above cases at some length. The law in force in England on the above question is summarised in Halsbury's Laws of England (Fourth Edition), Vol. 25, Para 579 thus :

"579. Position of third party, The policy money payable on the death of the assured may be expressed to be payable to a third party and the third party is then prima facie merely the agent for the time being of the legal owner and has his authority to receive the policy money and to give a good discharge; but he generally has no right to sue the insurers in his own name. The question has been raised whether the third party's authority to receive the policy money is terminated by the death of the assured; it seems, however, that unless and until they are otherwise directed by the assured's personal representatives the insurers may pay the money to the third party and get a good discharge from him."

.....

12. Moreover there is one other strong circumstance in this case which dissuades us from taking a view contrary to the decisions of all other High Courts and accepting the view expressed by the Delhi High Court in the two recent judgments delivered in the year 1978 and in the year 1982. The Act has been in force from the year 1938 and all along almost all the High Courts in India have taken the view that a mere nomination effected under section 39 does not



WEB COPY

deprive the heirs of their rights in the amount payable under a life insurance policy. Yet Parliament has not chosen to make any amendment to the Act. In such a situation unless there are strong and compelling reasons to hold that all these decisions are wholly erroneous, the Court should be slow to take a different view. The reasons given by the Delhi High Court are unconvincing. We, therefore, hold that the judgments of the Delhi High Court in Fauja Singh's case (supra) and in Mrs. Uma Sehgal's case (supra) do not lay down the law correctly. They are, therefore, overruled. We approve the views expressed by the other High

Courts on the meaning of section 39 of the Act and hold that a mere nomination made under section 39 of the Act does not have the effect of conferring on the nominee any beneficial interest in the amount payable under the life insurance policy on the death of the assured. The nomination only indicates the hand which is authorised to receive the amount, on the payment of which the insurer gets a valid discharge of its liability under the policy, The amount; however, can be claimed by the heirs of the assured in accordance with the law of succession governing them. (emphasis supplied)

13. In view of the above conclusion, the judgments and decrees of the High Court, the first appellate court and the trial court are liable to be set aside. They are accordingly set aside. Since it is not disputed that the plaintiffs are under the law of succession governing them each entitled to 1/3 share in the estate of the deceased, it is hereby declared that each of the plaintiffs is entitled to 1/3rd share in the amount received under the insurance policies in question and the interest which may have been earned by its investment. The suit stands decreed accordingly."

12. In Vishin N.Khandchandani v. Vidya Lachmandas Khanchandani [CDJ 2000 SC 353], the question whether the nominee specified in the National Savings Certificate, on the death of its holder, becomes entitled to the sum due under the certificate to the exclusion of all other persons ? Or whether the amount of the certificate can be retained by him for the benefit of the legal heirs of the deceased? came up for consideration before the



WEB COPY

Hon'ble Supreme Court and it was held as under:

" 9. It is contended on behalf of the appellants that the non obstante clause in Section 6 excludes all other persons, including the legal heirs of the deceased holder, to claim any right over the sum paid on account of the national savings certificates, to the nominee. There is no doubt that by non-obstante clause the Legislature devices means which are usually applied to give overriding effect to certain provisions over some contrary provisions that may be found either in the same enactment or some other statute. In other words such a clause is used to avoid the operation and effect of all contrary provisions. The phrase is equivalent to showing that the Act shall be no impediment to measure intended. To attract the applicability of the phrase, the whole of the section, the scheme of the Act and the objects and reasons for which such an enactment is made has to be kept in mind.

10. The submission made on behalf of the appellants has no substance in view of sub-section (2) of Section 8 and the Statement of Objects and Reasons necessitating the passing of the Act. Sub-section (1) of Section 8 provides that if any payment is made in accordance with the provisions of the Act to a nominee, the same shall be a full discharge from all further liabilities in respect of the sum so paid. Section 7 of the Act provides that after the death of the holder of the savings certificates payment of the sum shall be made to the nominee, if any, and sub-section (1) of Section 8 declares that such payment shall be a full discharge from all further liabilities in respect of the sum so paid. However, sub-section (2) of Section 8 specifies that the payment made to the nominee under sub-section (1) shall not preclude any executor or administrator or the legal representative of the deceased holder of a savings certificate from recovering from the person receiving the same under Section 7; the amount remaining in nominee's hand after deducting the amount of all debts or other demands lawfully paid or discharged by him in due course of administration. In other words though the nominee of the national savings certificates has a right to be paid the sum due on such



WEB COPY

savings certificates after the death of the holder, yet he retains the said amount for the benefit of the persons who are entitled to it under the law of succession applicable in the case, however, subject to the exception of deductions mentioned in the sub-section. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Act it is stated:

"The Post Office National Savings Certificate Ordinance, 1944 (42 of 1944), issued under Section 72 of the Ninth Schedule to the Government of India Act, 1935, as originally enacted and continued in force by virtue of the provisions of the India and Burma (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1940 (3 and 4 Geo. 6, Ch. 33) regulates the sale and discharge of National Savings Certificates issued through the Post Office. Suggestions have been made from time to time that as the production of legal proof of succession involves considerable delay and expense, the holders of savings certificates may be allowed the right to nominate one or more persons to receive the amounts due in respect of such certificates in the event of their death without the production of succession certificate or other proof of title. In seeking to amend that Ordinance for the above purpose, opportunity is taken to replace it by an Act of Parliament." (emphasis supplied)

11. In the light of what has been noticed herein above, it is apparent that though language and phraseology of Section 6 of the Act is different than the one used in Section 39 of the Insurance Act, yet, the effect of both the provisions is the same. The Act only makes the provisions regarding avoiding delay and expense in making the payment of the amount of the national savings certificates, to the nominee of holder, which has been considered to be beneficial both for the holder as also for the post office. Any amount paid to the nominee after valid deductions or becomes the estate of the deceased. Such an estate devolves upon all persons who are entitled to succession under law, custom or testament of the deceased holder. In other words, the law laid down by this Court in Sarbati Devi's case holds field and is equally applicable to the nominee becoming entitled to the payment of the amount on



WEB COPY

account of national savings certificates received by him under Section 6 read with Section 7 of the Act who in turn is liable to return the amount to those, in whose favour law creates beneficial interest, subject to the provisions of sub-section (2) of Section 8 of the Act. (emphasis supplied)

12. Under the circumstances this appeal is allowed with a direction that the succession certificates shall be issued in favour of the respondents in respect of debts detailed in Annexures A and B to the application filed in the Court of Civil Judge, Senior Division, Thane subject to their payment of necessary court fees and estate duty certificate. The respondents would, however, not be entitled to directly receive the amounts payable on account of debts payable under National Savings Certificates at Sl.Nos.17 to 26 in Annexure A and Sl.Nos.1 to 4 in Annexure B. The appellants are held entitled to receive the sum due on the aforesaid national savings certificates in which they are the nominees upon furnishing the undertaking in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 8 of the Act in the court of Civil Judge, Senior Division, Thane. The amount received by the appellants on account of the national savings certificates in which they are nominees shall be payable to the respondents after deduction of the amounts of debts or other demands lawfully paid or discharged, if any. Costs made easy."

13. A learned Single Judge of this Court in the decision in Vidya Hari Iyer v. M/s.Sundaram Finance Limited [CDJ 2020 MHC 4925], by following the ratio laid down in Sarabati Devi's case (cited supra) and Vishin N.Khandchandani's case (cited supra), has observed as follows:

"17. As far as Section 45ZA of the Banking Regulation Act is concerned, the above section indicate that the amount shall be paid to the nominee. It is also to be noted that Section 45ZD makes it clear that when there is an Order or a certificate or other authority from a Court obtained relating to such article is produced before the bank, the bank shall take due note of such decree, Order, certificate or other authority. Therefore, it cannot be said that even



WEB COPY

after the succession certificate is granted by the competent Court is produced before the bank, they cannot ignore the same merely on the basis of Section 45ZA of the Banking Regulations Act. Even though 45ZA contained non obstante clause, the Apex Court in Vishin N.

Khanchandani Vs. Vidya Lachamandas Khanchandani reported in 2000 (6) SCC 724 in para 11 has categorically held that though the over riding effect of non obstante clause to attract the applicability of the phrase, the whole of the section, the scheme of the Act and the objects and reasons for which such an enactment is made have to kept in mind, as the nominee has to be treated as a trustee and he is entitled to receive the amount only and he has to pay the amount to the persons who are entitled under law of succession. Therefore, when the succession certificate already granted, the object of the Indian Succession Act has to be given importance. Accordingly, the contention that only the nominee alone as per section 45ZA of the Banking Regulations Act is entitled to receive the money even after succession certificate is granted, cannot be countenanced. Therefore, merely because a suit has been filed at a later point of time at the instance of the nominee, despite the succession certificate has been produced, the same has no relevance to decide this application. If at all the second respondent in the event of succeeding in the suit in O.S.No.5683 of 2019, to realise the amount, this Court is of the view that some security has to be offered by the applicant herein. The learned counsel for the applicant Mr.Mohan submitted that in C.S.No.899 of 2017 already 1/4th share of the applicant has been declared and preliminary decree is already passed and charge may be created in respect of the above 1/4th share of the applicant towards the deposit amount till the interpleader suit is decided." (emphasis supplied)

14. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sarabati Devi's case (cited supra) held that nomination only indicated the hand which is authorized to receive the amount, on the payment of which the insurer get a valid discharge of its liability under the policy and the amount, however, can be claimed by the heirs of the assured in accordance



WEB COPY

with the Law of Succession governing them. The decision of this Court in Vidyaa Hari Iyer's case cited supra emphasis the dictum that the nominee has to be treated as a trustee and he is entitled to receive the amount only and he has to pay the amount to the persons who are entitled under Law of Succession.

15. It is not in dispute that the writ petitioners as well as the respondents 3 and 4 are Class-I Legal Heirs of the deceased. But the fourth respondent / mother of the petitioner has disputed the said fact. The grievance of the petitioners is that the respondents 3 and 4, being the parents of the deceased as well as nominees appointed by the deceased, are making attempts to withdraw the entire terminal benefits of the deceased, except the amount of Group Insurance amount of Rs.7,00,000/- and the respondents 3 and 4 are entitled only to their respective share as per nomination. Though the deceased late H.Jayachandran had nominated his parents, namely the respondents 3 and 4 as nominees, in view of the above settled legal position, the legal heirs of the deceased employee alone are entitled for their respective shares and the nominee cannot have any absolute right to claim the amount of the deceased.

16. In view of the above settled legal position in the decisions cited supra, the dispute with regard to claiming the benefits of the deceased has to be agitated only before the competent Civil Court. Therefore, it is open to either of the parties to approach the Civil Court and based on the Civil Court decree, the parties can approach the respondent 1 and 2 to claim their shares. However, in order to protect the interest of parties in the interregnum, this Court directs the respondent 1 and 2 / Life Insurance Corporation to deposit the terminal and other benefits except Group Insurance Amount of the deceased Late H.Jayachandran, in any one of the Nationalized Banks till obtaining of decree from the competent Civil Court. The respondents 1 and 2 shall also intimate to the petitioners as well as the contesting respondents / respondents 3 and 4, by furnishing the details as regards the deposit of amounts in nationalised bank.

17. The Writ Petition stands disposed of with the above directions. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

5. The aforesaid order of this Court held that the parties



concerned have to approach the Civil Court to claim the respective shares. Further, the aforesaid order has been passed by following the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Therefore, this Court cannot entertain this writ petition. Liberty is hereby granted to the petitioner to seek her remedy before the concerned Court.

6. In the light of the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as well as this Court, the writ petition stands dismissed with the above liberty. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ata/mst

To

The Manager (E & OS),
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
Chennai Divisional Officer,
C-47, II Avenue, Anna Nagar Plaza, Anna Nagar,
Chennai - 600 040.

W.P.No.9636 of 2022

BR(CO)
PM/06/05/2022