



W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 18.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

A.Selvarani

... Petitioner

Vs

The Management of
State Express Transport Corporation (Tamil Nadu) Ltd,
Rep by its Managing Director,
Pallavan Salai, Chennai – 2.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent to pay the petitioner interest at the rate of 6% per annum for the period of delay from 01.04.2024 to 09.09.2025 in paying the amounts paid towards the terminal benefits namely EPF Employee's Contribution and for the period of delay from 01.04.2024 to 22.09.2025 in paying the amount the amounts towards the terminal and pension benefits namely gratuity of her deceased / retired employee (late) M.Appakkannu, staff No.7957 within a time frame as may be fixed by this court and without affecting the right to claim balance amount towards those benefits.



W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Arunachalam
For Respondent : Mr.S.C.Herold Singh
Standing Counsel

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for a Mandamus, directing the respondent to pay interest to the petitioner at the rate of 6% per annum for the belated payment of terminal benefits from the date of her husband's retirement to the date of actual payment, within the time stipulated by this Court.

2.The case of the petitioner is that her husband joined as a Driver in the respondent Transport Corporation on 05.06.1989 After completion of 34 years of service, he retired from service on 31.03.2024. Subsequently he died on 10.06.2024. However, the retirement benefits, namely, Provident Fund, Gratuity and Leave Salary were settled only on 22.09.2025. Since the benefits have been settled belatedly, the respondent is liable to pay interest for the belated payment. Therefore, the petitioner gave a representation



W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

WEB COPY

dated 10.11.2025 to the respondent, however, the same did not evoke any response. Therefore, the petitioner has filed this writ petition for the above said relief.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in similar writ petitions, this Court has ordered for payment of interest at the rate of 6% p.a. for the belated payment of retirement benefits and therefore, the petitioner is also entitled for the same relief.

4.Mr.S.C.Herold Singh, learned Standing Counsel, takes notice on behalf of the respondent and submits that the terminal benefits of the deceased employee have been settled to the wife / petitioner on 23.09.2025.

5. By consent of both the parties, the writ petition is taken up for final hearing at the admission stage itself.



W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

WEB COPY

6.This Court paid its anxious consideration to the rival submissions made and also perused the materials placed on record.

7.The employer is liable to settle the retirement benefits to its employees without any delay and in case, if it is settled belatedly, it has to be compensated by way of interest for the belated payment. In this regard, the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***S.K.Dua vs. State of Haryana*** reported in **2008 (3) SCC 44**, has held as follows:

“14. In the circumstances, prima facie, we are of the view that the grievance voiced by the appellant appears to be well founded that he would be entitled to interest on such benefits. If there are statutory rules occupying the field, the appellant could claim payment of interest relying on such rules. If there are administrative instructions, guidelines or norms prescribed for the purpose, the appellant may claim benefit of interest on that basis. But even in absence of statutory rules, administrative instructions or guidelines, an employee can claim interest under Part III of the Constitution relying on Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution. The submission of the learned counsel for the appellant, that retiral benefits are not in the nature of “bounty” is, in our



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

opinion well founded and needs no authority in support thereof. In that view of the matter, in our considered opinion, the High Court was not right in dismissing the petition in living even without issuing notice to the respondents.”

8.Following the same, in a similar issue, a Division Bench of this Court, in W.A.(MD)No.403 of 2010, etc. batch, vide common order dated 04.07.2014, has fixed the rate of interest at 6% per annum and held as under:-

“5. even though there is no provision in the Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation Employees Pension Fund for payment of interest, cannot stand in the light of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in S.K.Dua v. State of Haryana and another, reported in (2008) 3 SCC 44. As a matter of fact, the Rules do not contemplate belated payment of retirement benefits. The Rules contemplate prompt payment. When the Rules contemplate prompt payment and not bleated payment, the Rules will not contain a provision for payment of interest. The Pension Fund which was created as a Trust by the Corporation was supposed to act in trust for the employees' benefit. If the Trust could not make payments



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

within the time stipulated, then, irrespective of whether there is any provision for payment of interest or not, the Corporation is obliged to make payment.”

9.Following the dictum laid down on this issue, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent/Transport Corporation to pay interest for the belated payment of retirement benefits at the rate of 6% per annum from 01.04.2024 till the date of actual disbursement, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

18.12.2025

NCC: Yes/No
Index:Yes/No
Internet:Yes
DSK

To

The Managing Director,
State Express Transport Corporation (Tamil Nadu) Ltd,
Pallavan Salai, Chennai – 2.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

DSK

W.P(MD)No.36299 of 2025

18.12.2025