



2024:DHC:7310



\$~48

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI***Date of Decision: 17.09.2024*+ **W.P.(C) 6615/2023**
PANCHI DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Chirayu Jain, Adv. with Mr.
Arvind Rawal, Adv.

versus

**DELHI BUILDING AND OTHER CONSTRUCTION
WORKERS WELFARE BOARD**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Abhay Dixit, Adv. with Mr.
Akhilesh Dixit, Adv.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU****TARA VITASTA GANJU, J.: (Oral)**

1. The present Petition has been filed by the Petitioner against the order dated 17.03.2023 passed by the Delhi Building & Other Construction Workers Welfare Board, District South West, Government of NCT of Delhi [hereinafter referred to as "Impugned Order"]. By the Impugned Order the Respondent/Board found the Petitioner/Claimant ineligible for funeral assistance/death claim benefits under Rules 277-279 of Delhi Building and Other Construction Workers Rules, 2002 [hereinafter referred to as "DBOCW Rules"] for not fulfilling the requirement of live membership at the time of claim and as also provided in Section 14 and 17 of the Building and Other Construction Workers Act, 1996 [hereinafter referred to as "BOCW Act"].

2. The brief facts are that the Petitioner is the wife of Late Shri Panchu



2024:DHC:7310



Ram who used to work as a 'beldar'. The husband of the Petitioner was registered as a beneficiary under the BOCW Act on 26.03.2010 by registration number 6010032812 and paid his annual contribution upto February, 2018 and thereafter, ceased to be a beneficiary in February/ March 2019 due to non-renewal of his registration. It is the case of the Petitioner that due to the ill-health of her husband coupled with the malfunctioning and shortage of staff in the Respondent/Board during the period from 2018-2020, the Petitioner's husband could not renew his registration.

3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that during the period between 2018 and 2020, the Petitioner's husband tried to renew his membership on multiple occasions. However, he was unable to do so due to administrative lapses such as short staffing and an 8 month long strike by the offices of the Respondent/Board. It is further contended that till the year 2018, nearly 5 lakh workers who were registered as beneficiaries under the BOCW Act, lost their registration as the renewals were extremely slow.

4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the husband of the Petitioner succumbed to cancer on 18.12.2020. Pursuant thereto, on 30.07.2021 the Petitioner applied for death and funeral claim benefits under Applications filed under Rules 277 and 279 of the DBOCW Rules. On 01.11.2021, the Petitioner applied for restoration of membership of her husband under proviso to Section 17 of the BOCW Act by providing a detailed justification regarding the lapse on the part of her husband in renewing the registration.

4.1 The aforesaid applications of the Petitioner, however, remained



2024:DHC:7310



pending and awaited decision despite multiple representations being made by the Petitioner which form part of the record. It is submitted that several representations were made on behalf of the Petitioner seeking directions for expeditious disposal of the pending applications including dated 01.12.2021, 19.09.2022, 08.10.2022, and 14.10.2022. Thereafter and pursuant to the order dated 04.11.2022 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Geeta & Ors. V. Secretary, Delhi Building and other Construction Workers Welfare Board & Ors.***¹, Applications were filed by the Petitioner to urge the Respondent/Board to expeditiously consider the Application(s) filed by the Petitioner.

5. The Respondent/Board addressed a communication to the Petitioner on 09.01.2023 requesting the Petitioner to submit applications under Rule 277 and 279 of the DBOCW Rules. Thereafter, the Petitioner re-filed his application on 10.02.2023.

6. By order dated 17.03.2023, an Application filed by the Petitioner was rejected by the Respondent/Board in view of the fact that the husband of the Petitioner had ceased to be beneficiary of the BOCW Act from the year 2017. In addition, it was held that in terms of Section 14(1) of the BOCW Act, where a beneficiary is not engaged in building works, his membership shall cease. Since, the husband of the Petitioner was not a “live member” at the time of his claim, the claim for funeral expenses/death benefits stood rejected.

7. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks to rely upon the judgment in

¹ Order dated 04.11.2022 in W.P.(C) 15260/2022



2024:DHC:7310



the *Geeta v. Delhi Building & Other Constructions Board*² [hereinafter referred to as "Geeta case"] to submit that a similar issue has been raised in this case and that, this Court allowing the Application filed under Section 17 of the BOCW Act had set aside the order of the Respondent/Board. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner further submits that the judgment in the *Geeta* case was upheld by a Division Bench of this Court in *Delhi Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Board v. Geeta*³. Reliance is placed on the following paragraphs of the judgment passed by the Division Bench in the *Delhi Building* case:

"8. Having heard learned counsel for the appellant, this Court is of the opinion that the present matter involves the interpretation of Section 17 of the Act. The said Section is reproduced hereinbelow:-

"17. Effect of non-payment of contribution.- When a beneficiary has not paid his contribution under sub-section (1) of section 16 for a continuous period of not less than one year, he shall cease to be a beneficiary: Provided that if the Secretary of the Board is satisfied that the non-payment of contribution was for a reasonable ground and that the building worker is willing to deposit the arrears, he may allow the building worker to deposit the contribution in arrears and on such deposit being made, the registration of building worker shall stand restored."

9. This Court is of the view that Section 17 of the Act stipulates that a worker shall cease to be a beneficiary if he has not paid contribution for a continuous period of not less than one year. Proviso thereto provides that Secretary of the Board is empowered to restore the registration. A plain reading of the provision suggests that no limitation has been prescribed for renewal of membership. Therefore, the contention that the Secretary of the Board cannot renew registration as it has lapsed three years and one month ago is untenable.

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

² 2023 SCC OnLine Del 7622

³ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 2201



2024:DHC:7310



12. Further, this Court takes judicial notice of the fact that the registrations under the Act had gone down from around 5 lakhs to a few thousands due to the administrative hurdles faced by the beneficiaries for renewal of their membership during the period 2018-2020.

13. Therefore, the assertion that the respondent's husband could not renew his membership due to reasons beyond his control is plausible and the respondent/her husband cannot be held liable for non-renewal of membership."

8. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has further submitted that the fact that there was a shortage of manpower with the Respondent/Board cannot be disputed as has been done by the order dated 17.03.2023 passed by the Respondent/Board. In support of this contention, learned Counsel for the Petitioner relied on the orders and judgments passed by the Coordinate Benches of this Court as set out below.

8.1 A Coordinate Bench of this Court in a matter titled as ***Kali Charan v. State (Govt of NCT of Delhi)***⁴ had observed that there is huge shortage of manpower and there is need of immediate recruitment in the Respondent/Board. The Court after noting that there were only two permanent staff members, and the remaining persons are on contract basis, and thus, directed the Government of NCT of Delhi to expedite the process of recruitment for the Respondent/Board. The Respondent/Board thereafter addressed a communication to the Secretary (Services), Services Department, Government of NCT of Delhi dated 02.09.2019 wherein it was stated that as on 22.08.2019, total 31,546 construction workers have applied for registration and renewal. However, only 14,904 applications were approved while 16,505 were pending approval. The relevant extract is

⁴ Orders dated 03.11.2017 and 13.07.2018 in CRL. M.C. 5889/2014



2024:DHC:7310



below:

“Now in the Board, w.e.f. 16/11/2018, the Registration and Renewal process has been carried out through e-district online portal (NIC). As on 22/08/2019, total 31,546 construction workers have applied for registration and renewal. However, only 14,904 applications were approved by the Dy. Secretaries and 16,505 applications are pending for their approval.”

8.2 In addition, reliance has been placed on order passed by this Court in a matter titled as ***Sunil Kumar Aledia v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors.***⁵ wherein a Division Bench of this Court passed directions to carry out the verification of the renewal applications without any delay. It was submitted that it was only pursuant to these orders that the registration process of the Respondent/Board was streamlined by adding mechanisms such as recommencement of renewal process including *via* online methods.

9. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner further submits that the contentions raised by the Respondent/Board before this Court were neither raised before the Respondent/Board nor was any finding in respect thereof given.

10. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner further contends that there exist genuine and reasonable grounds for restoring the registration of the Petitioner's husband and to process the claim applications filed by the Petitioner. Reliance is placed on the proviso to Section 14(1) of the BOCW Act which provides that any period of absence from the building or construction work due to any personal injury caused to the workman shall be excluded from the time period for computing ninety days as has to be computed under this section.



2024:DHC:7310



10.1 The proviso to Section 16(1) the BOCW Act provides that the Respondent/Board is empowered to waive the payment of contribution if the beneficiary is unable to pay the contribution due to financial hardship.

11. Learned Counsel for the Respondent/Board submits that the Impugned Order is in accordance with law and that the Board was functioning regularly between the year 2018 to 2020. It is further contended that the husband of the Petitioner was not engaged in any construction work on account of his illness, his registration cannot be renewed. Thus, it is contended that the Impugned Order does not suffer from any infirmity.

12. The BOCW Act is a social welfare measure enacted for the benefit of unorganized labour in India where jobs are temporary and working hours are uncertain. The basic amenities and welfare facilities provided to these workers are inadequate. The work is characterized by its casual nature, temporary relationship between employer and employee, uncertain working hours, lack of basic amenities and inadequacy of welfare facilities. It was enacted keeping in mind the socio-economic realities of the intended beneficiaries - the construction workers - aiming to tackle both administrative and bureaucratic hurdles faced by them on account of lack of knowledge and lack of access to professional resources.

12.1 The intention of the legislature was not to punish or deprive the worker who failed to renew his/her registration but to provide a remedy to enable the worker to overcome the difficulties caused by non-renewal. Section 17 of the BOCW Act is one such remedial provision. The proviso to

⁵ Order dated 20.05.2020 in W.P.(C)2991/2020



Section 17 of the BOCW Act thus states that where there are reasonable grounds for non-payment and the worker deposits the arrears, the delay can be condoned and the registration restored. It reads as under:

“17. Effect of non-payment of contribution - When a beneficiary has not paid his contribution under sub-section (1) of section 16 for a continuous period of not less than one year, he shall cease to be a beneficiary:

Provided that if the Secretary of the Board is satisfied that the non-payment of contribution was for a reasonable ground and that the building worker is willing to deposit the arrears, he may allow the building worker to deposit the contribution in arrears and on such deposit being made, the registration of building worker shall stand restored.”

13. It is no longer res integra that a beneficial legislation must be construed liberally and interpreted in a manner that advances its purpose so as to fructify the legislative intent. The Supreme Court in **Transport Corpn. of India v. ESI Corpn. And Anr.**⁶ held that a beneficial legislation must be construed in a correct perspective and where two views are possible on its applicability, a view which furthers the legislative intention should be preferred. The relevant extract is reproduced below:

“27. Before parting with the discussion on this point, it is necessary to keep in view the salient fact that the Act is a beneficial piece of legislation intended to provide benefits to employees in case of sickness, maternity, employment injury and for certain other matters in relation thereto. It is enacted with a view to ensuring social welfare and for providing safe insurance cover to employees who were likely to suffer from various physical illnesses during the course of their employment. Such a beneficial piece of legislation has to be construed in its correct perspective so as to fructify the legislative intention underlying its enactment. When two views are possible on its applicability to a given set of employees, that view which furthers the legislative intention should be preferred to the one which would

⁶ (2000) 1 SCC 332



2024:DHC:7310



frustrate it. *It is difficult to appreciate how it could be contended by the appellant with any emphasis that an employee working at its head office in Secunderabad would be governed by the beneficial sweep of the Act as admittedly the head office employees are covered by the Act, but once such an employee, whether working on the administrative side or connected with the actual transportation of goods, if transferred to the Bombay branch even with his consent, cannot be governed by the beneficial provisions of the Act...*

[Emphasis supplied]

14. In ***Builders Association of India and Anr. v. Union of India (UOI) and Anr.***⁷, while upholding the Constitutionality of the BOCW Act, a Division Bench of this Court held that the Act is a beneficial legislation aimed towards the welfare of building and other construction workers. The relevant extract of the said judgement reads as:

“5.8 The scheme of the BOCW Act indicates that the central focus of this statute is the building and construction worker and the welfare of such worker. Clearly the BOCW Act belongs to the genre of labour welfare legislation relatable to Articles 39(e), 42 and 43 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has in Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India [1984] 2 SCR 67 explained that such legislation would be straightaway enforceable under Article 21 which enshrines the right to human dignity. It was explained that (SCC p.184): "where legislation is already enacted by the State providing these basic requirements to the workmen and thus investing their right to live with basic human dignity, with concrete reality and content, the State can certainly be obligated to ensure observance of such legislation for inaction on the part of the State in securing implementation of such legislation would amount to denial of the right to live with human dignity enshrined in Article 21.

5.9. The BOCW Act envisages a network of authorities at the Central and State levels to ensure that the benefit of the legislation is made available to every building worker. *The provisions concerning registration of workers, providing them with identity cards, constitution of Welfare Boards and registration of beneficiaries under the Fund, providing for augmentation of the Fund and specifying the purposes for which the Fund will be used, providing for the safety and health of the*

⁷ 2007 SCC OnLine Del 327 : ILR (2007) 1 Del 1143



2024:DHC:7310



*worker, making the contravention of the provisions of the statute punishable and entailing penalties for the violator all go to **emphasise the primary purpose of the BOCW Act, which is the welfare of the building and construction worker**. These aspects of the BOCW Act are sought to be supplemented in considerable measure by the making of the Central Rules in 1998. Detailed rules have been made with regards to particular aspects of safety in construction work and for the health and welfare of the workers.”*

[Emphasis supplied]

14.1 It was further held that the interpretation of the provisions of the BOCW Act should be towards the welfare of building and other construction workers, and any contrary interpretation would have to be avoided.

15. The facts in the present case are that the Petitioner’s husband became a registered beneficiary on 26.03.2010 and its renewal lapsed in the year February/March 2019. The Petitioner's husband was a registered beneficiary for about 9 years and even thereafter made attempts to get the registration renewed.

15.1 Although, the applications for death and funeral claim benefits were filed by the Petitioner on 30.07.2021, the same were rejected by the Impugned Order on the ground that the Petitioner’s husband was not a live member at the time of the claim raised. The application filed by the Petitioner under Section 17 of the BOCW Act on 01.11.2021 also met the same fate, and had not even been dealt by the Respondent/Board at the time of deciding the Application. It is in this backdrop that the Petitioner approached this Court seeking setting aside of the order of rejection passed by the Respondent/Board in lieu of the fact that Petitioner was illegible for death and funeral claim benefits.



2024:DHC:7310



16. A Division Bench of this Court in the **Delhi Building** case also took judicial notice of the fact that the registration under the BOCW Act had gone down from 5 lakhs to a few thousands due to the administrative hurdles faced by beneficiaries for renewal of their membership during the period of 2018-2020. It was held by this Court that the denial of benefits by the Respondent/Board on the ground that the workman failed to renew his registration after the validity has come to an end would not be the correct interpretation of Section 17 of the BOCW Act.

16.1 In addition, it was only pursuant to the orders of the Division Bench of this Court in the **Suni Kumar Aledia** case, that the registration process of the Respondent/Board was streamlined by adding mechanisms such as recommencement of renewal process including via online methods.

17. This Court has recently in **Man Kunwar Vs. Delhi Building And Other Construction Workers Board**⁸ held that the BOCW Act is a social welfare measure enacted for the benefit of unorganized labour in India and its intent needs to be given effect to. It was held that the Petitioner in order to renew his membership was unable to do so due to reasons beyond his control is certainly plausible and evidenced from the orders passed by this Court which constituted a reasonable ground under the proviso to Section 17 of the BOCW Act. The relevant extract of the **Man Kunwar** case is set out below:

*“15. As stated above, the BOCW Act is a beneficial legislation and its intent needs to be given effect to. **The Petitioner has placed on record the orders and judgments of this Court to show that the circumstances which existed with the Respondent/Board during***

⁸ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 5705



2024:DHC:7310



the period from 2018 to 2020, were such that lakhs of similarly placed such workers were denied registrations/renewals.

xxx

xxx

xxx

17. There is a clear admission by the Respondent/Board in the 2019 communication of the problems of shortage of staff in the Board and of delay in the registration process. The assertion of the Petitioner that her husband despite his best efforts was unable to renew his membership during the period from 2018 to 2021, due to reasons beyond his control is certainly plausible and is evidenced by the orders passed by this Court from time to time. This would constitute a reasonable ground under the proviso to Section 17 of the BOCW Act and any other interpretation would not be in accordance with its legislative intent.

[Emphasis supplied]

18. As stated above, the BOCW Act is a beneficial legislation and its intent needs to be given effect to. The Petitioner has placed on record the orders and judgments of this Court to show that the circumstances which existed with the Respondent/Board during the period from 2018 to 2020, were such that lakhs of similarly placed such workers were denied registrations/renewals.

19. A Division Bench of this Court in *National Campaign Committee for Central Legislation on Construction Labour v. Delhi Building and Other Construction Workers Board*⁹ has held that workers shall continue to be entitled to benefits under the BOCW Act for a period of one year from the date he/she is liable to pay fresh contribution as per Section 16 of the BOCW Act. Thus, the registration of the Petitioner's husband would continue to be valid for a period of one year i.e., upto February/March 2019, when the renewal became due.

⁹ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 1257



2024:DHC:7310



20. This Court agrees with the contentions of the Petitioner that there are plausible reasons for workers such as the Petitioner not being able to renew its membership. As stated above, there is sufficient evidence in the form of communication and orders passed by this Court which are set out in paragraph 8 herein to show that the functioning of the Respondent/Board was impeded. The record shows that after the application for restoration was filed by the Petitioner, several hearings took place and the Petitioner complied with each of the Respondent/Board's request that was asked of him including for filing of submissions as well as providing documents. Undisputably, all these requirements were met by the Petitioner.

20.1 The proviso to Section 17 of the BOCW Act states that where there are reasonable grounds for non-payment, the delay can be condoned. The assertion of the Petitioner that despite his best efforts he was unable to renew his membership during the period from 2018 to 2020, due to reasons beyond his control is certainly plausible and evidenced from the orders passed by this Court from time to time. This would constitute a reasonable ground under the proviso to Section 17 of the BOCW Act and any other interpretation would lead to an interpretation of the provisions of the BOCW Act which is not in accordance with its legislative intent.

21. It has been contended by the Respondent/Board that the Petitioner in paragraph 8 of his Application has set out that the illness of the husband of the Petitioner was for the period from 2017 to 2019 and in terms of the proviso to Section 14(1) of the BOCW Act, the period of absence due to



injury arising out in the course of employment has to be excluded. It is averred that due to the nature of work performed by the husband of the Petitioner, he contracted cancer and later succumbed to the same.

22. The proviso to Section 14(1) of the BOCW Act states that any time a worker is absent from the building or other construction work due to personal injury caused by an accident arising out of and during the course of their employment, such period of absence, shall be excluded from the computation under this section. Section 14(1) of the BOCW Act is reproduced below:

“14. Cessation as a beneficiary.

(1) A building worker who has been registered as a beneficiary under this Act shall cease. to be as such when he attains the age of sixty years or when he is not engaged in building or other construction work for not less than ninety days in a year:

Provided that in computing the period of ninety days under this sub- section, there shall be excluded any period of absence from the building or other construction work due to any personal injury caused to the building worker by accident arising out of and in the course of his employment.

....”

22.1 It was contended that the illness of the Petitioner’s husband was on account of his employment, thus the proviso to sub-Section 1 of Section 14 of the BOCW Act is applicable to the period of his illness. A plain reading of the proviso shows that a period of 90 days shall be excluded where an injury is caused by an accident during the course of employment. The Petitioner contracting to cancer would thus, not fall within the proviso.

23. Rule 277 and 278 of the DBOCW Rules provides for sanction of



2024:DHC:7310



funeral expenses in the sum of Rs.10,000/- and death benefits in the sum of Rs.1 lac, respectively to a member registered under the BOCW Act. Rule 278 further provides that where the death is due to an accident during the course of employment, an additional compensation may be given to the dependents/nominees, provided that the deceased was registered under the BOCW Act and the death occurred during and out of course of employment. Rule 279 is the process for application for death benefits. Rules 277 to 279 are reproduced below:

*“277. **Payment of Funeral Assistance.** - The Board may sanction an amount of ten thousand rupees to the nominees/dependents of a member towards funeral expenses in case of death of a member. An application in Form No. XLI shall be submitted for this benefit. The said benefit shall be applicable from the date of registration.*

*278. **Payment of Death Benefit.** - The Board may sanction an amount of one lac rupees to the nominees/dependants of a member towards death benefit, in case of death of the member. The said benefit will be applicable from the date of registration.*

If the death is due to an accident, during the course of employment, the nominee/dependants of member may be given two lac rupees towards death benefit. This amount will be in addition to the amount of compensation which may be payable to the deceased member under any other law for the time being in force. The said benefit will be available for members from the date of registration and non registered construction workers also:

Provided that (i) The deceased was a building construction worker as defined in sec. 2(e) of the Act, but was not registered with Delhi Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Board, (ii) Occurrence of Death "during and out of course of employment". Among other things, the claim would be admissible subject to supplemented by an FIR, post mortem report and other supporting / related documents which would establish the above facts. In addition to these documents, judicial determination of the fact that death occurred during and out of course of employment need to be examined and verified by district DLCs.

*279. **Application for Death Benefit** - (1) A nominee who is entitled to*



2024:DHC:7310



Death Benefit under this rule shall submit to the Secretary or any other officer authorised by him an application in Form No.XXXVII. A Certificate regarding the death/accident death issued by a Government doctor not below the rank of an Assistant Surgeon shall be produce along with the application and other documents specified by the Board.

(2) The Secretary or the officer authorised by him may on receipt of the application conduct an enquiry with regard to the eligibility of the applicant.

(3) If the Secretary or the officer authorised by him is satisfied that the person who has applied for financial assistance is entitled for such benefit he may sanction the amount.

(4) The sanctioning authority shall maintain a register for this purpose in Form No.XXXVIII.

(5) A person aggrieved by any decision taken under sub-rule (3) may file an appeal before the Board within sixty days from the date of receipt of the order under that sub-rule and the decision of the Board thereon shall be final."

23.1 Since, the proviso is not applicable to the Petitioner's husband, no additional compensation is due, however, the entitlement of the Petitioner's funeral assistance of Rs.10,000/- and the death benefit payment of Rs. 1 lacs is required to be looked into.

24. The Impugned Order has recorded that the Petitioner's husband ceased to be a beneficiary w.e.f. February/ March 2019 and never filed any Application for restoration of his registration. Thus, the Respondent/Board has contended that the Petitioner's husband ceased to be a member/beneficiary under the BOCW Act.

25. As discussed above, an Application under Section 17 of the BOCW Act was filed by the Petitioner on 01.11.2021 and forms part of the record. This Application was however not considered at the time of passing of the



2024:DHC:7310



Impugned Order.

25.1 This Court agrees with the contentions of the Petitioner that there are plausible reasons for workers such as the predecessor-in-interest of the Petitioner not being able to renew its membership. There is sufficient evidence in the form of communication and orders passed by this Court which are set out in paragraph 8 herein, to show that the functioning of the Respondent/Board was impeded.

26. As stated above, the BOCW Act is a beneficial legislation and its intent needs to be given effect to. The Petitioner has placed on record the orders and judgments of this Court to show that the circumstances which existed with the Respondent/Board during the period from 2018 to 2020, were such that lakhs of similarly placed such workers were denied registrations/renewals. The husband of the Petitioner was a registered beneficiary under the BOCW Act for several years and thereafter admittedly fell terminally ill and during the period from two years preceding his death he was suffering from cancer. A Coordinate Bench of this Court in the **Geeta** case had held that the Petitioner's husband made regular payments for seven years and thereafter contracted cancer and passed away because of cancer and similarly relying on Section 17 of the BOCW Act allowed the claim of the Petitioner.

27. The Impugned Order admittedly does not address the Application filed by the Petitioner under Section 17 of the BOCW Act dated 01.11.2021, wherein the reasons for his inability to renew his registration after February/ March 2019, have been mentioned. In fact, the Impugned Order fails to deal



2024:DHC:7310



with the 01.11.2021 Application at all.

28. In view of the foregoing discussion, the Impugned Order is set aside. The claim made by the widow of the worker for restoration of the membership of her husband is hereby allowed. The Petitioner shall deposit the arrears in contribution due on behalf of her deceased husband within two weeks. Subject to deposit and completion of any requisite formalities, the Respondent/Board shall renew the registration within four weeks thereafter and process the claim of the Petitioner.

29. Once the requisite formalities of registration are complete, the funeral assistance and death benefits of Late Shri Panchu Ram shall also be released to the Petitioner.

30. The Petition is disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2024/SA

Click here to check corrigendum, if any