## IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.11.2014

CORAM:

## THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH

W.P.No.31172 of 2013

and M.P.No.1 of 2013

- 1. Tmt.K.Vijayalakshmi
- 2. Selvi K.Padmini
- 3. Mrs.Banumathi

... Petitioners

Vs.

- The Manager, (E.R.),
   Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
   Marketing Division, Southern Region,
   No.139, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
   (Nungambakkam High Road),
   Chennai 600 034
- 2. The Commissioner,
  Employees'Provident Fund Organisation,
  No.37, Royapettah High Road,
  Opposite Swagat Hotel,
  Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 014.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the  $2^{\rm nd}$  respondent to pay the pension to the petitioner as per the order passed in O.P.No.258 of 2009 dated 22.04.2010 passed by this Court.

For Petitioners For Respondents Mr.R.Karunagaran

: Mr.K.Gunasekar, SCGSC for R.2

No Appearance for R.1

ORDER

The  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner is the the  $2^{\rm nd}$  wife of the deceased employee V.Kothandapani and the  $3^{\rm rd}$  petitioner is the first wife of the deceased. The  $2^{\rm nd}$  petitioner is the daughter of the  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner. In the Succession O.P filed before this Court in O.P.No.258 of 2009 by the petitioners, the following order was passed on 22.4.2010:

''... That K.Vijayalakshmi, the  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner herein, on complying with Rules of this Court and on their behalf a certificate under part X of the Indian Succession Act XXXIX of 1925 do issue herein, out of and under the seal of this Court, and the same be granted to

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Mrs.K.Vijayhalakshmi, the  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner herein, empowering her to collect the debts by way of terminal benefits morefully set out in the schedule hereunder and to receive the same.

- 2. That from and out of the terminal benefits of the deceased morefully set out in the Schedule hereunder, the petitioners herein, shall receive 65% of the terminal benefits (i.e.,) Rs.4,12,015.50/- (Rupees four laksh twelve thousand fifteen and paise fifty only) and the respondent herein shall be entitled to get remaining 35% of the terminal benefits Rs.2,21,854.50/- (Rupees two laksh twenty one thousand eight hundred and fifty four and paise fifty only).
- 3. That the monthly pension amount of the deceased Kothandapani, shall be equally shared by the  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner and the respondent herein.

S <mark>CHEDULE</mark>						
Sl.No.		Name of	Debtor	Amount of	Descrip	
/				debt on	date of i	nstrument
	0			date of	if any b	y which
				petition -	the de	ebt is
	T			RA =	secu	red.
1	0	Manager,	Indian	Rs.6,33,870	Retirement	
- N	-	Oil Co	rporation .	42	Benefits	such as
- N	I	Limited,	Chennai		P>F.,	Gratuity,
1				183	Leave	encash,
	VIIII			9	GSLI:	General
	-VII		7,1446		Insurance.	
	1.47		AT AREA (1984)	The Control of the Co		

- 2. Based upon the said order passed, the petitioners approached this Court seeking payment of retirement benefits of deceased Kothandapani.
- 3. The objection raised on behalf of the  $2^{nd}$  respondent is that as per Para 16(2) (b) of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995, when there are two or more widows the family pension shall be payable to the eldest and her next surviving widow, if any. Therefore, learned counsel for the  $2^{nd}$  respondent submitted that the petitioner No.3 alone is entitled to.
- 4. This Court is not concerned with the entitlement of the parties. It is the  $3^{\rm rd}$  petitioner herein, who is willing to give a part of the amount of pension to the  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner as per the order passed in 0.P.No.258 of 2009. In other words, what belongs to petitioner No.3 is sought to be given to petitioner No.1 at her request. There is no dispute between the parties. Both the wives of the deceased are the petitioners 1 and 3 herein. Therefore, this Court is of the view that Rule 16(2)(b) of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995, is not violated. The said rule will come into play when

there is a dispute between the petitioners. That is not the case here. Similarly the entitlement of the  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner is in the event of the  $3^{\rm rd}$  petitioner pre-deceased her, which situation which has not arisen now.

- 5. In such view of the matter, direction is issued to the  $2^{\rm nd}$  respondent to make the payment to the petitioner Nos.1 and 3 as per the order passed in 0.P.No.258 of 2009 dated 22.4.2010. Before making said payment, the  $1^{\rm st}$  petitioner once again is directed to file 10(d) form before the  $2^{\rm nd}$  respondent expressing her consent to part with the pension amount to the  $3^{\rm rd}$  petitioner.
- 6. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-Assist<mark>ant Registra</mark>r Dated:<mark>16.12.14</mark>

True Copy

Sub Assistant Registrar

То

- The Manager, (E.R.),
   Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
   Marketing Division, Southern Region,
   No.139, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
   (Nungambakkam High Road),
   Chennai 600 034
- 2. The Commissioner, Employees'Provident Fund Organisation, No.37, Royapettah High Road, Opposite Swagat Hotel, Chennai, Tamil Nadu - 600 014.

+1 cc to M/s.R.Karunagaran, Advocate, SR.58048

+1 cc to Mr.K.Gunasekar, Sr.Panel Counsel Central Government, SR.58136

rsk(co) krd 17/12

W.P.No.31172 of 2013