



2026:CGHC:13858



2026:CGHC:13858
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 767 of 2025

1. Ku. Kavita Singh D/o Late Dharamraj Singh Aged About 24 Years R/o Village And Post Sathini, Ward No. 3, Near School Kapuri Huzur, Laxmanpur Huzur, Rewa,(Madhya Pradesh).

... Petitioner

versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through- Secretary, Home Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.).
2. Commandant 12th Battalion, Chhattisgarh Security Force, Ramanujganj, District- Balrampur- Ramanujganj (CG).
3. District Treasury Officer, District- Balrampur Ramanujganj (CG)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	: Mr. CJK Rao, Advocate
For Respondents	: Mr. Ajay Kumrani, Panel Lawyer

S.B.: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Order On Board

23/03/2026

1. Petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1. That the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a direction to the respondent authorities to direct the respondent authorities to finalize the



pension case of the petitioner and continue the pension to the petitioner.

10.2. That the Hon'ble High Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to pay all the arrears amount pertaining to the amount of pension.

10.3. That the Hon'ble High Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief, as it may deem fit and appropriate."

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner's father died in harness on 6.3.2015 and petitioner's mother also died on 28.8.2015. After the death of her parents, family pension was being paid to petitioner being unmarried daughter of deceased employee. However, since June 2024 family pension, which is being paid to petitioner, has been abruptly stopped, therefore, a direction be issued to respondents to resume family pension in favour of petitioner.
3. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes submissions of learned counsel for petitioner and submits that petitioner is not entitled for family pension in view specific provision under Rule 47 (6) of the Chhattisgarh Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1976 (for short 'the Rules of 1976') because petitioner has attained the age of 25 years. He also contended that to get family pension even after completion of 25 years of age, petitioner has not pleaded any exceptional circumstances.



4. Heard learned counsel for respective parties and perused the documents available in record of writ petition.
5. It is not in dispute that after the death of her parents, petitioner being daughter of deceased employee was paid family pension till May, 2024. According to submission of learned counsel for petitioner, family pension of petitioner is stopped from June 2024. According to pleadings made in reply submitted on behalf of the State, as petitioner has attained age of 25 years on 3.5.2024, therefore, pension was stopped.
6. Rule 47 of the Rules of 1976 deals with contributory family pension and clause (iii) of sub-rule (6) of Rule 47 provides that in the case of an unmarried daughter, family pension shall be payable to her until she attains the age of 24 years or until she gets married, whichever is earlier. Clause (iii) of sub-rule (6) of Rule 47 is extracted herein below for ready reference:-

“(iii) in the case of an unmarried daughter, until she attains the age of 24 years or until she gets married, whichever is earlier.”
7. In view of afore quoted specific provision under the Rules of 1976, in the opinion of this Court, petitioner would be entitle for family pension up-til she attains the age of 25 years or gets married, whichever is earlier. It is not disputed by learned counsel for petitioner that petitioner has already



attained the age of 25 years on 3.5.2024. No exceptional circumstances, as provided under Clause (iii) of sub-rule (6) of Rule 47, is pleaded by petitioner so as to continue benefit of family pension to petitioner till her life. Hence, in the opinion of this Court, the respondents have not committed any error in taking decision to stop relief of family pension to petitioner, who has attained age of 25 years on 3.5.2024, as submitted by learned counsel for petitioner.

8. In view of above discussion, I do not find any merit in this writ petition, the same is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

roshan/-