



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

123

CWP-14692-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.05.2026

Kiranjit Kaur and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sandeep Thakan, Advocate
with Mr. D.S. Maan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Sonak, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Jyotnoor Kaur Sethi, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to transfer the pension from petitioner No.1 to petitioner No.2 on account of the request submitted by the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the husband of petitioner No.1 was appointed as Peon on 21.06.2001 and he died in harness on 14.12.2013, as is evident from the Death Certificate (Annexure P-1). He further submits that the petitioners, being the widow (petitioner No.1) and the minor daughter (petitioner No. 2), born on 10.10.2013 (Annexure P-4), are the only surviving



family members of the deceased employee. He further contends that owing to the inordinate delay on the part of the respondents in releasing the service benefits of deceased employee, the petitioner No.1 was constrained to approach this Court by way of filing CWP No.5022 of 2021, which was disposed of vide order dated 03.03.2021 (Annexure P-2), and in compliance thereof, the pensionary benefits were released in favour of petitioner No. 1 vide Pension Payment Order (PPO) dated 14.06.2021 (Annexure P-3). Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that since petitioner No.1 now intends to remarry she has voluntarily moved an application dated 17.12.2025 (Annexure P-5) seeking transfer of the family pension in favour of her minor daughter i.e. petitioner No.2, who is admittedly an eligible family member in terms of the Family Pension Scheme (Annexure P-6), which expressly recognizes unmarried daughters up to the age of 25 years as eligible recipients of family pension. He further contends that despite serving a legal notice dated 11.03.2026 (Annexure P-7), the respondents have failed to take any action in the matter. Lastly, he submits that the issue involved is no longer *res integra*, as an identical controversy has already been adjudicated by this Court in CWP No.4835 of 2025, decided on 20.02.2025 (Annexure P-8), wherein it has been categorically held that an eligible family member is entitled to receive family pension and therefore, the petitioners are entitled to similar relief.

3. Ms. Jyotnoor Kaur Sethi, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 and filed Memo of Appearance,



which is taken on record. The Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 submits that petitioner No.1 has not yet been remarried, however, her claim would be considered as and when she submit the proof of her re-marriage and the family pension would be transferred in the name of petitioner No.2 within a period of six weeks thereafter.

5. In response thereto, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he is satisfied with the stand taken by learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 and contends that the present petition may be disposed of accordingly.

6. In the wake of the statement made by learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, the present petition is disposed of and the respondent/Corporation is directed to consider and decide the claim of the petitioners as and when petitioner No.1 furnishes the proof of her re-marriage and thereafter, pass appropriate orders transferring the family pension in favour of petitioner No.2, within a period of six weeks from the date of submission of such proof.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

12.05.2026
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No