Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6760 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

In the matter of

Mr. Ajendra Singh Ghura

Vs.

The General Manager
Northern Railway
(Respondent No. 1)

&

The Principal Chief Security Commissioner, RPF (NR)
Respondent No. 2

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, a person with 83% locomotor disability, stated that he is the son of late Head Clerk of the Railway Protection Force, Northern Railway, and that he has been a person with locomotor disability since birth, is unemployed and was dependent on his father. He submitted that his father, vide letter dated 30.12.2015, had informed the Railway authorities during his lifetime about his disability and dependency and had requested that family pension be granted to him after his death, and that the representation was processed on 05.01.2016.

1.2 The Complainant stated that his earlier disability certificate recorded 60% disability, whereas the UDID certificate issued in February 2026 records 83% permanent locomotor disability. He submitted that, after his father's death, he repeatedly pursued his claim for family pension before the Railway authorities through representations and correspondence during 2018, 2020, 2021, 2025 and 2026, but that the family pension has neither been sanctioned nor released to him.

2. Notice of Admissibility

2.1 A notice dated 22.09.2026 under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016, was issued to the Respondent for a hearing on 01.10.2026 to determine the admissibility of the case and find out if this can be resolved without further quasi-judicial intervention of this Court.

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6760 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

3. Respondent's Submission

3.1 The Respondent, Northern Railway (Railway Protection Force, Lucknow Division), in its reply dated 28.09.2026, submitted that the Complainant had applied for family pension following the demise of his father on 24.03.2018, when he was reported to have 60% disability. The case was referred to the Divisional Railway Hospital for medical examination, and a Medical Examination Committee examined the Complainant on 30.10.2021 and observed that, despite having 60% disability, he was capable of earning his livelihood. Accordingly, the claim for family pension was not considered, the case was closed and the Complainant was informed of the decision on 30.10.2021.

3.2 The Respondent further submitted that the Complainant re-applied on 14.03.2026 claiming 83% locomotor disability, which was received from the Accounts Department on 21.04.2026, with the original application received on 30.04.2026. The Respondent stated that the Chief Medical Superintendent, vide letter dated 14.07.2026, had informed that the Complainant had already been medically examined on 30.10.2021 and found capable of earning his livelihood, and hence the case was held not eligible for family pension.

4. Hearing

4.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted on 01.10.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1	Mr. Ajendra Singh Ghura	Complainant	Online
2	Mr. Bishwa Nath Mishra, ASC, RPF Lucknow Division	Respondent No. 2	Online

5. Record of Proceedings

5.1 The Respondent reiterated its written reply and submitted that the percentage of disability, including the 83% now claimed on the basis of the subsequent document, does not by itself establish entitlement to family pension, and that Rule 75(6) of the Railway Services (Pension) Rules, 1993 does not provide for

automatic grant of family pension merely on the basis of the percentage of disability. The Respondent stated that the claim of 83% disability was not accepted as sufficient evidence of entitlement; that the Complainant's entitlement itself is not established and, therefore, the claims for family pension from 24.03.2018, arrears, medical allowance and interest do not arise at this stage; and that the claims for compensation and other consequential benefits are also not admitted. The Respondent stated that the Complainant was informed of the position on 28.09.2026 and that the same had also been uploaded.

5.2 The Court asked whether the employee had disclosed the disability of his dependent son during his service, and whether the same was recorded anywhere in the service records or the PPO. The Respondent stated that the disability was not submitted by the employee and that the position regarding the service records and the PPO would be confirmed.

5.3 The Court observed that verbal communication alone does not create an entitlement to family pension. The Court observed that the service records of the employee ought to reflect his dependents, including a son with disability, that the PPO ought to reflect the same, and that the capacity or incapacity to earn a livelihood has to be established through medical certification. The Court noted that the disability certificate on record appears to have been obtained in 2021, after the demise of the employee, and that it was therefore not clear whether any certificate was submitted or available during the employee's lifetime.

5.4 The Court observed that the claim of the Complainant can be examined only on the basis of documents, and that it would be validated only if (i) the name of the Complainant is mentioned in the PPO as a dependent, (ii) the disability of the dependent was submitted to the employer prior to the preparation of the PPO, and (iii) the incapacity to earn a livelihood is certified by a medical board. The Court observed that if any one of these is absent, the Complainant cannot claim family pension, and that if the Complainant produces all three documents, he would be eligible from the date of their submission.

5.5 The Respondent is requested to submit its response in writing within fifteen days, covering point-wise all the representations of the Complainant and of his late father, the administrative or legal constraints due to which the claim was not considered, and the proof or justification for the denial or refusal of the claim, along with the PPO and all relevant documents for examination by this Court. A copy of the Respondent's response may be furnished to the Complainant, who shall have the right to file a rejoinder within seven days thereafter. This Court will issue its order after evaluating the documents of both parties.

5.6 The Court informed that, at this stage, the matter is not being registered as a case. If no response is received from the Respondent within the stipulated time, the matter will be registered as a case. If, on

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6760 **Dated:** 15/10/2026

examination, the Respondent's position is found to be correct, the matter will be closed.

Yours faithfully,



(VIKAS TRIVEDI)
Dy. Chief Commissioner