



\$~63

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 3306/2026**

VEDO

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. P Sureshan, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, CGSC with Ms. Usha Jamnal, Ms. Nyasa Sharma, and Mr. Ankit Khatri, Advs. for UOI.

Mr. Kumar Gaurav, SI/Exe., CISF for UOI.

Mr. Rajiv Kapur, SC for SBI along with Mr. Akshit Kapur, AoR for R-5/SBI.

Mr. Santosh Kumar Rout, SC for SBI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

27.04.2026

CM APPL. 27627/2026 [for early hearing]

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of Applicant/Petitioner seeking early hearing and disposal of the present writ petition.

2. The application stands allowed.

W.P.(C) 3306/2026

3. The present writ petition is taken up for hearing and final disposal with the consent of learned counsel representing the parties.

4. Petty dispute in the present writ petition has been noticed in the

W.P.(C) 3306/2026

Page 1 of 3



order dated 16.03.2026, which is extracted as under:

“CM APPL. 15987/2026 (for exemption)

1. *Allowed, subject to just exceptions.*
2. *The application is disposed of.*

W.P.(C) 3306/2026

3. *At request of Mr. Sureshan learned counsel for the petitioner, we implead the Manager, State Bank of India ('SBI'), 10201-202, Padam Singh Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005, Code No. 1275, Tele: 25755172, 25755174-176, Telefax: 25755173 and Pay & Accounts Office (CISF), Ministry of Home Affairs, Mahaleka Niyantarak Bhawan, 5th Floor, E-Block, GPOA Complex, INA, New Delhi-110023 to the array of parties as respondent nos. 5 and 6, respectively.*
4. *Learned counsel for respondent nos. 1 to 4 states that the respondents have identified the petitioner as the wife of the deceased employee. In fact, two reports have been submitted to the bank but still the bank has raised an objection with regard to the name of the wife of the deceased employee.*
5. *There are objections to the spelling of the name of the wife of the deceased employee, inasmuch as the name at some places is 'Vedo Devi' and at other places it is 'Vidya Devi'.*
6. *Issue notice. Learned counsel for respondent nos. 1 to 4 accepts notice.*
7. *Let notice be issued to the respondent nos. 5 and 6 returnable for 15.04.2026. In addition, notice be issued to the Standing Counsel for SBI. Amended memo of parties be filed.*
8. *List on 15.04.2026.”*

5. There is no dispute with regard to identity of the Petitioner as on two different occasions, Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 have carried out verification.

6. Despite giving sufficient opportunity, the said Respondents have failed to take remedial measures.

7. The facts of this case present a very sorry state of affairs. The Petitioner herein is an illiterate widow of Late Laxman Singh, who served in the Central Industrial Security Force. He expired on 05.01.2007. Nearly two decades have passed since then, despite which, a small error in spelling of the name is resulting in denial of benefit which is due to the Petitioner.



8. Keeping in view the aforesaid position, while expressing anguish, directions are issued to the Respondents to pay the pensionary benefits along with arrears of pension for the last more than 19 years along with interest at the rate of 9% per annum to the Petitioner within a period of one month from today, failing which, this Court will be compelled to take serious view of the matter.

9. The present writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

10. Liberty is granted to the Petitioner to file an application for revival of the present writ petition if the order is not complied with.

11. Date of 14.09.2026 already fixed, stands cancelled.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 27, 2026

'KDK'