



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17212 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

W.P.No.17212 of 2025

K.Geetha

... Petitioner

Vs.

M/s.State Express Transport Corporation,
Rep by its Managing Director,
No.2, Pallavan Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.

... Respondent

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondent herein to take the entire service of the petitioner's husband Late R.R.Kumar from 01.05.1993 to 30.04.2023 and settle the difference in retirement benefits and consequently revise the family pension of the petitioner herein in view of the order of respondent dated 29.09.2000 and in light of order of this Court in W.P.No.2130 of 2023 dated 30.01.2023 and by considering the representation of the petitioner dated 05.03.2025.



W.P.No.17212 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Soundar Raj

For Respondent : Mr.S.Siva Subramani
Standing Counsel

ORDER

The instant writ petition has been filed with a prayer for issuing a Mandamus, to direct the respondent herein to take the entire service of the petitioner's husband Late R.R.Kumar from 01.05.1993 to 30.04.2023 and settle the difference in retirement benefits and consequently revise the family pension of the petitioner herein in view of the order of respondent dated 29.09.2000 and in light of the order of this Court in W.P.No.2130 of 2023 dated 30.01.2023 and by considering the representation of the petitioner dated 05.03.2025.

2. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner's husband had retired from the service of the respondent on 13.04.2023 as “Helper”. It is the further contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that her retirement benefit was settled with effect from the date of issuance of order of the respondent dated 29.09.2000. Thereafter, she made a representation dated 05.03.2025 to the respondent seeking the



W.P.No.17212 of 2025

WEB COPY

difference in retirement benefits. Since, there was no response from the respondent, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.

3. Heard the learned counsel for both sides and perused the materials available on record.

4. Though there is disputed facts between the parties, taking into consideration of the fact that the representation made by the petitioner is yet to be considered, this Court without going into merits of the matter, deems it appropriate to direct the respondent to consider the representation dated 05.03.2025 on it's own merits and in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. In the result, this Writ Petition is disposed of with the above observations. No costs.

03.06.2025

jas

Index : Yes/No

Speaking order /Non Speaking Order

Neutral Citation : Yes/No



W.P.No.17212 of 2025

WEB COPY

The Managing Director,
State Express Transport Corporation,
No.2, Pallavan Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.17212 of 2025

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

jas

W.P.No.17212 of 2025

03.06.2025