

APHC010132782025



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3529]

TUESDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 6975/2025

Between:

1.CHAGANTIPATI JOHN WESLEY, S/O. JOHN HIDE, R/O. FLAT NO. 504
SURYA APARTMENTS, ASHOK NAGAR, ELURU, ELURU DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPLE
SECRETARY, FINANCE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI,
AMARAVATI, GUNTUR, DISTRICT.

2.THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH,
STALIN TOWER ADJACENT TO MANORAMA HOTEL MG ROAD,
GOVERNORPETA, VIJAYAWADA.

3.THE SUPERIDENTENT, O/O. THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT COURT WEST
GODAVARI DISTRICT.

4.THE DISTRICT TRESURY OFFICER, AMINA PET, ELURU, WEST
GODAVARI DISTRICT.

5.UPPE RAMYA, D/O. UPPE DAVID, AGED 33 YEARS, R/O. DOOR NO. 2-5,
AYYAPARAJUGUDEM, LENGAPALEM MANDAL. WEST GODAVARI
DISTRICT.

6.UPPE RAMESH, S/O. UPPE DAVID, AGED 30 YEARS, R/O. DOOR NO. 2-
5, AYYAPARAJUGUDEM, LINGAPALEM MANDAL WEST GODAVARI
DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring inaction of the respondents more particularly respondent No. 3 and 4 in considering the representation submitted by the petitioner dated 10.02.2025 and 15.02.2025 in releasing the death benefits of the wife of the petitioner namely late Chagantipati Jhansi Rani who worked as a Junior assistant before the I Addl. District Judge Office and she died harness due to brain tumor on 07.03.2020 petitioner is legally wedded husband and their marriage was performed on 20.06.2011, the respondent without passing any speaking order to the petitioner detailed explanation dated 10.02.2025 and rejected the application which is highly illegal, arbitrary and violation of Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and in violation to the principals of natural justice and consequently direct the 4th respondent not to release the death benefits to the unofficial respondents until getting declaration from the Competent Civil Court and pass such

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased may be pleased to direct the respondents to consider the representation submitted by the petitioner dated 10.02.2025 and 15.02.2025 for release of death benefits of the wife of the petitioner pending disposal of the main Writ petition and pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

- 1.Dr CHALLA SRINIVASA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.B VASANTHA LAKSHMI
- 2.GP FOR SERVICES I
- 3.CHELLE RAYAN ABHISHEK

The Court made the following order: *per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao*)

The petitioner is said to be married to late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani, who was employed as a Junior Assistant in the District Court, Eluru, West Godavari District. She passed away on 07.03.2020. Thereafter, the petitioner sought release of the death benefits and other consequential service benefits payable on account of her demise, as he was her husband and sole legal heir. The petitioner also relied upon a Will that is said to have been executed by the late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani.

2. This application of the petitioner was referred, for enquiry, to the I Additional District Judge, Eluru.

3. In the course of the enquiry, the petitioner also raised a claim that late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani had filed an application for changing the nomination to receive her death/retirement benefits etc., whereby she sought to nominate the petitioner as her sole nominee to receive such benefits.

4. The I Additional District Judge conducted an enquiry and came to the conclusion that the application, for change of nominee, relied upon by the petitioner could not be accepted. He had pointed out to various discrepancies and anomalies in the said application, including the fact that the note file etc., that is said to be initiated on the said application did not contain any signatures of the relevant authorities at that point of time.

5. The Principal District Judge, on the basis of the said report had rejected the application of the petitioner, by an order, dated 04.02.2025.

6. Aggrieved by the said order of rejection the petitioner approached this Court by way of the present writ petition.

7. The case of the petitioner is that he is the husband of late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani and would be entitled to receive all the death/retirement benefits. The petitioner would also contend that the mother of late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani who was shown as the nominee in her service register, had expired and as such he would be entitled to the entire benefits.

8. The relevant service rules stipulate that it is the nominee who would be receiving the death/retirement benefits of the deceased employee. Thereafter, it would be open to the other legal heirs to make such claims against the nominee for their share of such benefits, if they are entitled to such share.

9. In the present case, the nominee mentioned in the service register of late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani is her mother, Smt. U.Kamamma. The alternate nominees, in the event of Smt. U.Kamamma predeceasing late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani, are the niece and nephew of Smt. U.Jhansi Rani, who are arrayed as respondent Nos.5 & 6 in the writ petition.

10. The contention of the petitioner that late Smt. U.Jhansi Rani had taken steps to change the nominee cannot be accepted by this Court, at this stage,

in view of the specific findings given in the enquiry of the report of the I Additional District Judge.

11. On the question of whether the petitioner would be entitled to the entire benefits and whether Smt. U.Kamamma is alive or not and the consequence of such demise are matters which do not fall within the purview of the present writ petition.

12. In those circumstances, it would only be appropriate to leave it open to the petitioner to avail such remedies as may be available to him in law against either Smt. U.Kamamma or respondent Nos.5 & 6.

13. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J

T.C.D. SEKHAR, J

Date:16.06.2026

DSB

126

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 6975/2025

(per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao)

Date:16.06.2026
DSB