



\$~33

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

%

Date of Decision: 7th March, 2025

+

W.P.(C) 2934/2025 & CM APPL. 13908-13909/2025**SMT SARASWATI DEVI**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. N. K. Gupta, Advocate.

versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Rout, Standing
Counsel for SBI**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner seeks direction to respondents *inter alia* to pay her a sum of Rs.60 lacs with interest.
2. The husband of petitioner was a police official and was lastly posted on duty at PS Mandawar, District Bijnor, U.P., as Constable. While being on duty, he met with an accident in which he, eventually, lost his life. FIR for commission of offences under Section 279/304A/427 IPC was also registered.
3. It is stated to be a *hit and run* case.
4. The grievance of petitioner is that U.P. Police personnel have been provided with facility by State Bank of India (SBI) and as per such policy and consequent MOU, in case of any such accident, resulting into death, the police official is entitled to receive a sum of Rs.40 lacs from SBI. It is submitted that despite there being a representation to the abovesaid effect, the amount to which petitioner is, lawfully, entitled



to, has not been paid.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to representation dated 30.11.2024, addressed to Regional Manager, State Bank of India, Parliament Street, New Delhi as well as to the Branch Manager of State Bank of India, Mandawar Branch, Bijnor, U.P.

6. It is reiterated that there is no decision on the abovesaid representation, as yet. He also submits that a copy of the abovesaid representation was even forwarded to the Headquarter of State Bank of India, but to no avail.

7. Learned Standing Counsel for respondent appears on advance notice and accepts notice.

8. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that, at the moment, petitioner would feel satisfied if there is a specific direction to respondent/Bank to decide the abovesaid representation in a time-bound manner. He, however, submits that, in case, petitioner is aggrieved by the outcome of her such representation, she be also given liberty to approach this Court again.

9. In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of by directing respondent/State Bank of India to dispose of the abovesaid representation as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of two weeks from the date of the receipt of the present order.

10. Needless to say, in case, petitioner is aggrieved by the outcome of her such representation, she would be at liberty to approach this Court again.

11. Registry is directed to send a copy of this order to the Regional



Manager, State Bank of India, Parliament Street, New Delhi through Special Messenger.

12. A copy of this order be also given dasti to learned counsel for petitioner and be also provided to learned Standing Counsel for State Bank of India to ensure that there is no unwarranted delay in disposal of the representation of petitioner.

13. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MARCH 7, 2025

st/kt