



2026:AHC-LKO:25890-DB

A.F.R.

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**LUCKNOW**

**WRIT - C No. - 1637 of 2026**

Nanhe Lal

.....Petitioner (s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Its Prin. Secy.  
Revenue Deptt . Lko . And 2 Others

.....Respondents(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Zoheb Ahmad, Shravan Kumar,  
Tauseef Ali Ansari

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C . , Zafar Aziz

**Court No. – 3**

**HON'BLE SHEKHAR B. SARAF, J.**

**HON'BLE ABDHESH KUMAR CHAUDHARY, J.**

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. Deepshikha, learned Chief Standing Counsel for the State-respondent.

2. This is a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, wherein the writ petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated November 30, 2024 by which the claim of the petitioner under the Mukhymantri Kisan Evam Sarvhit Bima Yojna (hereinafter referred to as the “the

Mukhymantri Yojna”) has been rejected on the ground that the petitioner did not fall within the said Mukhymantri Yojna.

3. The facts of the case are that the petitioner’s wife, namely, Nanhki Sharma died on October 6, 2016 as a result of knife wound while she was cutting grass in the field. The facts reveal that certain unknown assailants murdered the wife of the petitioner and the post-mortem report indicates that death was caused due to knife wound.

4. The petitioner relied on the Yojna that indicates that accidents ‘bima’/insurance should be provided to the following persons :-

*"भाग-1 व्यक्तिगतदुर्घटना बीमा :- परिवार के मुखिया /रोटी अर्जक: की रेल/रोड/वायुयान से दुर्घटना, किसी भी टकराव, गिरने के कारण चोट, गैस रिसाव, सर्प काटने, बिच्छू नेवला, छिपकली काटने से मरना, सिलेण्डर फटने के कारण विकलांगतां या मृत्यु, विस्फोट, कुत्ता काटने, जंगली जानवर के काटने से मरना, जलना, डूबना, बाढ़ में बह, जाना, किसी भी प्रकार से हाथ-पैर कटं जाना एवं विषालता आदि दुर्घटना में शामिल हैं। व्यक्तिगत दुर्घटना बीमा के अन्तर्गत केवल परिवार का मुखियां / रोटी अर्जक आच्छादित है।"*

5. A subsequent clarification to the Yojna has stated that if the person was under the influence of alcohol, committed suicide or was involved in any illegal activities during which the accident takes place, the same would not be treated as an accidental death.

6. The petitioner relied upon a judgment of the Division Bench of this Court dated 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2019 passed in **WRIT - C No. - 35148 of 2017(Smt. Bindu Devi Vs. State Of U.P. And 2 Others)** in which the Court had allowed the claim of the petitioner therein under the Scheme of Samajwadi Kisan & Sarvhit Bima Yojana Kisan Accident Insurance Policy. In that case, the death of the petitioner-husband had taken place due to injuries caused by knife wound.

7. Upon perusal of the present Mukhymantri Yojna, we are of the view that the events provided under the Eligibility Clause are specific and benefit can only be provided if the deceased falls within the said eligibility criteria. It may be noted that the present Mukhymantri Yojna is different from the Scheme that was in operation and was interpreted by the Co-ordinate Bench in *Smt. Bindu Devi (Supra)*. Thus, the said Co-ordinate Bench Judgment does not come to the aid of the petitioner.

8. Further, upon a perusal of the above Mukhymantri Yojna, we are of the view that accidental death caused due to railways, roadways and air travel would be included in the present scheme. If a person meets with an accident on the railway tracks, or on any road or dies in a plane crash, the same benefit would be available to the relatives of the deceased. However, this accidental claim cannot be extended to cases where persons are murdered. Even though, loosely termed one may treat a murder as an accidental phenomenon, however such accidents are not covered under the said Mukhymantri Yojna. The eligibility criteria has been specifically defined and the same can be interpreted for events which are *ejusdem generis* to the events enumerated therein. Surely, a murder or an incident of like nature as is narrated in the present facts and circumstances, is not an accident as envisaged under the Mukhymantri Yojna for availing compensation.

9. No doubt, the said Mukhymantri Yojna is a beneficial scheme/Yojna, which provides for financial help to the needy, however, the object behind the said scheme is loud and clear, inasmuch it not only mentions the scheme is applicable for uncertain and unfortunate events, but also enumerates these events which ought to have happened with any person, before the relatives can become eligible for benefit under the said scheme. The said Mukhymantri Yojna is not applicable due to death covered by any reason, except as provided in the scheme/Yojna itself.

10. In light of the same, we are unable to grant any relief to the petitioner and as such the present writ petition fails. We make it clear that the petitioner may be eligible for other benefits under various other

schemes of the Government as may be prevalent on the date of the death of the deceased and may avail the same in accordance with law.

**11.** Accordingly, the writ petition is **disposed of**.

**(Abdhesh Kumar Chaudhary,J.) (Shekhar B. Saraf,J.)**

**April 15, 2026**  
Anuj Singh