



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, AT NAGPUR.**

CIVIL APPLICATION (CAF) NO. 834 OF 2025

IN

FIRST APPEAL NO. 196 OF 2018 (D)

(Meena wd/o Mahabaleshwar Gupta and others ..vs.. Union of India, through G.M. Central Railway,
Mumbai)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. Rohini Mankar, Advocate h/f. Mr. P.S. Mirache, Advocate for the appellants,
Ms. Neerja Chaubey, Advocate for the respondent.

CORAM : ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.

DATED : 20-06-2025

Applicants/appellants have filed this application to direct the respondent to comply with the order dated 29-11-2024, passed in Civil Application No. 3258/2024.

2. It is contended that the respondent authority is not complying with the order dated 29-11-2024 passed by this Court in Civil Application No. 3258/2024, as a discrepancy appears in the name of applicant/appellant No.1, 'Meena' and 'Meenabai'. In the petition as well as in the judgment, her name was referred to as '*Meena*'; however, on her Bank Account, PAN Card, and Aadhar Card, her name is mentioned as '*Meenabai*'. Ms. Rohini Mankar, learned Advocate for the applicants, submitted that 'bai' is not part of her name, but it is suffixed to her name '*Meena*' as a title of respect. Therefore, it would not make any difference. She further submitted that the applicants have submitted the details of their bank accounts twice to the respondent authority; however, the respondent authority did not act on the same, but is insisting that she has to submit an affidavit in that regard. Therefore, the applicants have moved this application.

3. Ms. Neerja Chaubey, learned Advocate for the respondent, does not dispute the identity of 'Meena' and 'Meenabai'. However, the respondent authority has submitted that due to a discrepancy in the name, she has to file an affidavit in this respect.

4. It is pertinent to note that, the respondent is not disputing her identity, in such an eventuality, I find substance in the contentions of the learned Advocate for the applicants regarding the names of applicants No.1, 'Meena' and 'Meenabai', as being the same, with the second name differing only in the addition of the suffix 'bai' as a title of respect. It further appears that all the applicants had submitted their bank account details to the respondent. In such circumstances, in my view, it was the duty of the respondent to transfer the said amount into the bank accounts of the applicants without any delay. It is pertinent to note that when they were not disputing the identity of applicant No.1, in that case, it was incumbent on the respondent authority to transfer the said amount into the bank accounts of the applicants as per the order of this Court. However, the respondent did not comply with the order passed by this Court.

5. Having considered the above factual position and discussion, the application is allowed. The respondent authority is directed to transfer the compensation amount along with accrued interest thereon, as per the award, into the bank accounts of the applicants, including applicant No.1 'Meena/Meenabai', *within three weeks from the receipt of a copy of this order*. If the respondent authority fails to transfer the said compensation amount as per the order, in such circumstances, a necessary order will be passed against the

persons who will be found negligent for not complying with the order of this Court. The learned Advocate is to inform the order to the concerned respondent authority.

6. The application is disposed of.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

adgokar