

ITEM NO.37

COURT NO.15

SECTION XIV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 10637/2020

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 17-12-2019 in WP(C) No. 5738/2019 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

LADO DEVI

Respondent(s)

Date : 15-05-2024 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Vikramjeet Banerjee, A.S.G.
Mr. P V Yogeswaran, Adv.
Mr. Noor Rampal, Adv.
Ms. Vaishali Verma, Adv.
Mr. Annirudh Sharma Ii, Adv.
Mr. Vishnu Shankar Jain, Adv.
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. A K Trivedi, Adv.
Mr. Vaibhav Trivedi, Adv.
Dr. Ram Sankar, Adv.
Mrs. Harini Ramsankar, Adv.
Mr. S I Sharuk Kumar, Adv.
Mr. P Srinivasan, Adv.
M/S. Ram Sankar & Co, AOR

Mr. P. Srinivasan, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1 We have heard Mr. Vikramjeet Banerjee, the learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the Union of India and Mr P. Srinivasan, the learned counsel

appearing for the respondent.

- 2 The respondent herein preferred a Writ Petition (Civil) No 5738 of 2019 in the High Court of Delhi seeking direction to the Union to fix her Family Pension at Rs.4,887/- (Rupees four thousand eight hundred and eighty seven only) with effect from 1st January, 2006 in accordance with the Office Memorandum dated 26 January, 2013.
- 3 It appears from the materials on record that the husband of the petitioner was serving with the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) and he retired on 1st January, 1993 on completing 33 years of qualifying service. During his life time, he was in receipt of service pension.
- 4 The High Court took the view that there was no justification for the Union to deny family pension worked out on the basis that the pay scale of the husband of the respondent herein was revised to Rs. 6,500-10,500/- consequent upon the Sixth Central Pay Commission. Accordingly, the petition was allowed and the relief as prayed for was granted.
- 5 The Union came before this Court with the present Special Leave Petition.
- 6 We take notice of the fact that the order passed by the High Court has been stayed. However, there is a development. The respondent has passed away. Mr. P. Srinivasan, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent makes a statement that his client has no Legal Representative.
- 7 In such circumstances, we see no good reason to now adjudicate this Petition on

merits because there will be no financial implication for the petitioner-Union.

8 In view of the aforesaid, this Special Leave Petition is disposed of as having become infructuous.

9 However, we kept the question of law involved in the matter open.

10 Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(GULSHAN KUMAR ARORA)
AR-CUM-PS

(RAM SUBHAG SINGH)
COURT MASTER