



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 534 of 2026

1 - Mrs. Ermeena Beck W/o Lt. Shri Anand Kumar Beck Aged About 61 Years
Residing At Uslapur Behind Daduram Traders, Near Reliance Tower Uslapur,
Mungeli Road, Bilaspur, Dist. Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Government Of Chhattisgarh, Law And Legislative
Affairs Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, C.G.
492002

2 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Finance,
Mahanadi Bhavan, Atal Nagar, Raipur, Dist. Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Divisional Joint Controller Of Accounts Pension Division Chhattisgarh, Raipur

4 - District Treasury Officer/ Accountant District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

5 - Centralized Pension Processing Centre (Cpcc) State Bank Of India, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh

6 - High Court Of Chhattisgarh Through Registrar General, Bodri, Bilaspur
Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

Order on Board

19/01/2026	Mr. Naveen Nirala, Advocate along with Mr. Arpan Pradhan, Advocate for the Petitioner. Mr. Khulesh Sahu, Panel Lawyer for the Respondents No. 1 to 4/State. Mr. P.R. Patankar, Advocate for the Respondent No. 5. Issue notice to the respondents. Learned counsel for the respective respondents accepts notice. Hence, no process fee is required to be paid for these respondents. Issue notice to the Respondent No. 6 on payment of process fee, as per rules. Notice be made returnable within 03 weeks. Also heard on I.A. No. 01/2026 which is an application for grant of interim relief. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that that the petitioner is a widow lady and is dependent upon pension. He contended that the petitioner was served with the impugned recovery notice dated 24.12.2025 (Annexure P/1) mentioning recovery for a sum of Rs. 10,16,841/- and further, that the Respondent/Bank has mentioned for deduction of Rs. 40,068/- per month from the pension of petitioner which is arbitrary and erroneous. The decision of recover is taken without giving any opportunity of hearing to the petitioner which is in violation of principles of natural justice. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Respondent No. 5 opposes the submission and submits that in view of the grounds raised in the writ petition, he may be granted time to file

reply to the writ petition as also, the interim application.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents enclosed along with the writ petition.

On due consideration of the submission of learned counsel for the parties, facts and circumstances of the case and documents enclosed along with the writ petition, purely as an interim measure, it is directed that recovery pursuant to the order/letter dated 24.12.2025 (Annexure P/1) from the petitioner shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.

Learned counsel for the respondents are granted 04 weeks time to file reply.

List this case after 04 weeks.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Dey