



**258-3 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
 AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-4239-2023

Date of decision: 10.11.2025

Shri Bhagwan Rohilla and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Abhijeet Singh, Advocate
 for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Sonak, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rajesh Hooda, Advocate
for respondents No.3 & 5.

Mr. Vishal Mehta, Advocate
for respondent No.4 (through V.C.).

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing respondent No.4 to submit unequivocal and clear joint options as contemplated in paragraph 26(6) of EPFS 1952 and under erstwhile proviso to paragraph 11(3) or paragraph 11(4) of EPS 1995.

2. Learned counsel for respondents No.3 & 5 submits that petitioners No.1, 2, 4, 6 to 8, 10, 12 & 15 are already getting higher pension and their claim has already been approved. Further, petitioner No.3, namely, Nirmal Singh and petitioner No.13, namely, Lalit Sharma, are pre 2014 retiree and before retirement, they have not exercised their joint option in terms of paragraph 26(6) of EPFS 1952 and under erstwhile proviso to paragraph 11(3)



CWP-4239-2023

-2-

or paragraph 11(4) of EPS 1995 and their cases are covered by the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Writ Petition (Civil) No.97 of 2025 titled as Powergrid Retired Employees' Association (PREA) Vs. Union of India and others*** and this Court in ***Om Parkash and others Vs. Union of India and others (CWP-35154-2024 & connected cases)***, decided on 24.09.2025, as such, their claims are required to be rejected. Further, the cases of petitioner No.5, namely, Sunita Rani and petitioner No.9, namely, Ranjit Singh, are under process which will be considered and decided within a period of three months. Petitioner No.11, namely, Sangeeta Sharma has deposited her cheques towards her contribution, however, they were not honoured because of insufficient funds and petitioners No.14 & 16, namely, Rajan Gupta and Rupinder Kaur, respectively, have not deposited their contribution despite issuance of demand notice.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners No.11, 14 & 16 would deposit their contribution within a period of four weeks if they so desire and their claims may be decided in terms of the statement made by respondents No.3 & 5 within a period of two months from the date of deposit of their contribution.

4. In view of the discussion above, the present civil writ petition is dismissed *qua* petitioners No.3 & 13 in terms of the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Writ Petition (Civil) No.97 of 2025 titled as Powergrid Retired Employees' Association (PREA) Vs. Union of India and others*** and this Court in ***Om Parkash and others Vs. Union of India and others (CWP-35154-2024 & connected cases)***, decided on 24.09.2025.



CWP-4239-2023

-3-

5. However, *qua* petitioners No.11, 14 & 16, the present civil writ petition is disposed of and the respondents are directed to consider the claim of petitioners No.11, 14 & 16 and decide the same in light of the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***R.C. Gupta's case (supra)*** and ***Sunil Kumar B.' case (supra)*** and the judgment rendered by this Court in ***Inderjit Singh Kaknani's case (supra)***. Petitioners No.11, 14 & 16 are directed to deposit their contribution within a period of four weeks if they so desire and the respondents would consider and decide the same in terms of the statement made by respondents No.3 & 5 within a period of two months from the date of deposit of their contribution. Needless to say, if petitioners No.11, 14 & 16 are found entitled to the benefits under Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, the same shall be released to them forthwith.

6. Further, the petitioners would be at liberty to file fresh petition with regard to their claim regard *pro rata* distribution of funds.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

10.11.2025

Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No