



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

216

CWP-5261-2025

Date of Decision: 19.08.2025

Dharampal Ex. RFN. No.13736752

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Sehgal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vibhor Bansal, Senior Panel Counsel,
for respondent Nos.1 to 4-UOI.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the only grievance being raised by the petitioner is that vide order dated 21.12.2020, copy of which has been appended as Annexure P-4, the petitioner has been granted the benefit of arrears of preceding three years prior to filing of OA No.2697 of 2019, whereas the petitioner should have been granted the benefit for a period of three year prior to filing of OA No.1247 of 2015, in which OA, same claim as has been raised in OA No.2697 of 2019, was raised, but the same got disposed of on the ground that the second appeal was pending decision.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner had filed an OA No.1247 of 2015, which was disposed of by the Tribunal



directing the respondents to decide the appeal, which order had ultimately gone against the petitioner and the petitioner again filed an OA No.2697 of 2019 challenging the said order, which has been allowed. Learned counsel submits that while granting the relief, the arrears have been restricted for a period of three years prior to the filing of OA No.2697 of 2019, whereas the same should have been allowed for a period of three years prior to the filing of OA No.1247 of 2015, which was initially filed asking the same relief as has been granted in OA No.2697 of 2019.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents does not deny the fact that the petitioner had initially filed an OA bearing No.1247 of 2015, which led to the passing of order dated 04.11.2015, which was ultimately set aside while deciding OA No.2697 of 2019, which was filed by the petitioner subsequently challenging the order rejecting the claim of the petitioner.

4. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case with their able assistance.

5. The grant of arrears for a period of three years prior to approaching the Court means that whenever the applicant approaches the Court for the redressal of his grievance, the arrears are to be restricted from the said date. The conceded position is that the petitioner had approached the Tribunal initially by filing OA No.1247 of 2015, which was filed on 12.08.2015. That being so, the Tribunal should have restricted the arrears for a period of three years prior to 12.08.2015.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents has not been able to dispute the said fact.

7. Hence, the impugned order dated 21.12.2020 (Annexure p-4)



passed by the Tribunal is accordingly modified to the extent that the petitioner is entitled for the arrears for the period of three years prior to 12.08.2015, when OA No.1247 of 2015 was filed.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

August 19, 2025
harish

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No