INDIALAW

CIVIL

When Nominees and Heirs Collide: Madras High Court Resolves Insurance Dispute

AUTHOR Rahul Sundaram

PUBLISHED 12 March 2025

In a judgment that clarifies the rights of legal heirs versus nominated beneficiaries in insurance policy disputes, the Madras High Court has delivered a decision that balances statutory obligations with familial equity. The case, W.P.No.29882 of 2023, highlights the complex interplay between insurance law and succession rights, offering guidance for similar disputes across India.

The dispute originated from the death of Dr. Maheswar in 2016, who held LIC policy No.707456621. His mother, A. Devika, challenged LIC's decision to release the entire policy amount to the nominated beneficiary, Dr. M.V. Nandhinee (the deceased's wife). The petitioner asserted her right as a Class-I legal heir to one-third of the policy proceeds, alongside the beneficiary and the beneficiary's daughter.

The petitioner's counsel argued that nomination under an insurance policy does not automatically divest other legal heirs of their rightful shares under succession laws. They contended that the Insurance Company should recognize the petitioner's statutory entitlement as a legal heir, despite the nomination in favour of the second respondent.

The respondents' counsel countered that under Section 39 of the Insurance Act, 1938, particularly subsection 7, the nominated beneficiary is entitled to the entire policy amount as her absolute property. They relied on precedents including K.R. Sakthi Murugeswari v. Divisional Manager, LIC and Mallela Manimala v. Mallela Lakshmi Padmavathi, which distinguish between "beneficiary nominees" and "collector nominees."

The court carefully considered these arguments alongside the statutory framework. Justice D. Bharatha Chakravarthy recognized that while Section 39 generally treats certain nominees as beneficiaries entitled to the policy amount as their own property, the court could enable a consensual distribution among legal heirs when the beneficiary nominee agrees to such an arrangement before court.

The Ratio

The court established that when there is a validly nominated beneficiary under Section 39(7) of the Insurance Act, that beneficiary is entitled to claim the entire policy amount and hold the money in trust subject to the claims made by the legal heirs who are entitled to a share in the sum assured. The judgment reaffirmed that the Insurance Company's primary legal obligation is to disburse the policy proceeds to the nominated beneficiary or collector nominee, as applicable under the law.

Importantly, the court recognized that insurance companies are not required to resolve disputes between legal heirs and nominees, as their responsibility ends once they transfer the policy amount to the nominated beneficiary. This principle ensures that insurance companies remain neutral in familial disputes while upholding their statutory duties.

However, in the peculiar fact of the case, when the beneficiary nominee herself acknowledges the claims of other legal heirs and agrees to a distribution of the policy proceeds the court found no necessity to invoke the general legal principles governing nominee beneficiaries under Section 39 of the Insurance Act, 1938. In its decision, the court directed LIC to disburse the policy amount as follows:

– One-third to the petitioner, A. Devika

– Two-thirds to the second respondent, Dr. M.V. Nandhinee, **including the share of the minor daughter**

The court ordered both parties to submit required documents within two weeks, with LIC required to process the claim and release funds within eight weeks thereafter.

Conclusion

This judgment reinforces important principles under the Insurance Act, 1938, particularly regarding the rights of nominated beneficiaries and the obligations of insurance companies. By clarifying that a validly nominated beneficiary under Section 39(7) holds the policy amount as their absolute property, the court has provided clear guidance on the statutory framework governing insurance policy disbursements.

The decision confirms that insurance companies fulfil their legal obligations by disbursing funds to the nominated beneficiary, regardless of familial disputes over inheritance. This precedent will guide future cases involving conflicts between nominated beneficiaries and legal heirs, ensuring consistent application of Section 39 while respecting the legislative intent behind the distinction between beneficiary and collector nominees. The ruling establishes that while courts may enable consensual resolutions between parties, the primary legal obligation of insurance companies remains to follow the nomination as recorded under the policy.

For further details write to contact@indialaw.in