



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

125+247

Decided on : 27.08.2025

125-12

CWP-3586-2025 (O&M)

MALKIT SINGH

. .Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-3651-2025 (O&M)

Mohan SINGH

. .Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-6253-2025 (O&M)

RAM KUMAR

. .Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-8502-2025 (O&M)

RAJESH KUMAR

. .Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents



**CWP-3586-2025 (O&M) and
connected case**

-2-

CWP-8515-2025 (O&M)

TEJA SINGH

. .Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-8527-2025 (O&M)

MOOL RAJ

. .Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-8862-2025 (O&M)

TARA SINGH

. .Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-8959-2025 (O&M)

CHANCHAL DEVI

.Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-13753-2025 (O&M)

RANDHIR

.Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

CWP-13929-2025 (O&M)

DAYANAND MEHLA

.Petitioner

Versus



**CWP-3586-2025 (O&M) and
connected case**

-3-

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS . . . Respondents

CWP-13932-2025 (O&M)

CHANDER BHAN .Petitioner
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS . . . Respondents

CWP-4315-2025 (O&M)

BRIJESH .Petitioner
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS . . . Respondents

247-3

CWP-550-2025 (O&M)

HARJINDER SINGH .Petitioner
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS . . . Respondents

CWP-4302-2025 (O&M)

BALJEET SINGH .Petitioner
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS . . . Respondents

CWP-12310-2025 (O&M)

RAMESH KUMAR .Petitioner
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI



**CWP-3586-2025 (O&M) and
connected case**

-4-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

PRESENT: Mr. Arshit Goel, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP-12310, 13929, 13932 of 2025.

Mr. B. S. Khaira, Senior Panel Counsel
for the respondents-UI in CWP-8515-2025

Mr. Tarun Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-6253-2025.

Mr. Satyapal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India with
Ms. Bhavana Datta, Senior Panel Counsel- UI.

Ms. Bhavana Datta, Senior Panel Counsel- UI.

Ms. Neha Jain, Senior Panel Counsel- UI
in CWP-3582, 4315 of 2025

Ms. Geeta Singwal, Senior Panel Counsel in CWP-8527-2025.

Mr. Karan Kumar Jund, Senior Panel Counsel-UI
in CWP-8862-2025.

Mr. Rohit Verma, Senior Panel Counsel
in CWP-550, 4302, 12310 of 2025.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. Present bunch of petitions, the details of which are mentioned in the heading, involve common point of law and common set of facts, hence, they are being dealt together. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from CWP No.3586 of 2025.

2. In the present petition, the prayer of the petitioner is for implementation of the order dated 06.03.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No. 5-Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (herein after referred to Tribunal), by which, the petitioner has been granted the benefit of disability pension by rounding of his disability element from 30 % to 50 % in view the settled principle of law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Union of India and others versus Ram Avtar,**

**2014 SCC ONLINE, SC 1761,**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the relief has been granted to the petitioner by the Tribunal but the same has not been implemented qua the petitioner by the Tribunal so far and that too without any valid justification and even the execution petitions have also been filed by the petitioner before the Tribunal for implementation of the same but the same are being adjourned continuously and no effective relief is being granted to the petitioner despite the fact that there is no hindrance for implementation of the order dated 06.03.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Tribunal in favour of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner will be satisfied at this stage in case, an appropriate direction be given to the respondents to implement the said order passed by the Tribunal where there is no impediment so that the officers who have served the Nation during their life time are liable of the relief which has been given to them by the competent Court of law during their life time so that they can avail the same during their lifetime.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents- UOI submits that all the efforts will be made by the authorities concerned to implement the orders passed by the Tribunal as early as possible so as to give the necessary relief to the petitioners whose claim has been allowed by the Tribunal.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

7. It may be noticed that after hearing the parties, as it is undisputed that the claim has been allowed in favour of the petitioner by the Competent Court of law and there is no impediment qua implementation of



**CWP-3586-2025 (O&M) and
connected case**

-6-

the same, hence, it is directed to the authorities concerned which is supposed to implement the order passed by the Tribunal in favour of the petitioner, will implement the same within the period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order in case there is no impediment.

7. It is made clear that in case, the said order passed by the Tribunal in favour of the petitioner is not implemented by the authorities concerned in case there is no impediment within the prescribed time then the strict view will be taken by this Court without any compassion for non-implementation of the same by the authorities concerned so that a soldier who has served the Nation and has been allowed a certain relief, should be able to get the benefit of said relief as early as possible so as to live a dignified life ahead.

8. It has been brought to the notice of this Court that one of the soldiers is 85 years old is still looking forward for the implementation of the relief granted by the competent Court of law despite there being no impediment for the implementation of the same.

9. Further it may be noticed that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India while passing order in **Special Leave To appeal (C) No. 19654 of 2022 titled as Bhoj Raj Garg versus Goyal Education and Welfare Society and others' decided on 18.11.2022** has held that where the execution petitions are pending, the competent court of law directed to decide the said execution petitions within the period of six months from the date of filing the said execution petition.

10. The similar judgment passed in case of **Periyammal (Dead) and others versus V. Rajamani and Another, 2025 INSC 329** it has been again reiterated by this Court while passing the order dated 05.04.2025,



**CWP-3586-2025 (O&M) and
connected case**

-7-

Hence, the tribunal is requested to follow such direction as being issued by Hon'ble supreme Court of India in aforesaid judgments while dealing with the execution petition.

11. The present petitions are disposed of in above terms.
12. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

**(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE**

27.08.2025

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: ~~Yes~~/No