



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

[108]

CWP-15404-2025

Date of Decision: 11.08.2025

BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LTD. (BSNL). PETITIONER

VERSUS

**PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
(CAT) CHANDIGARH BENCH, CHANDIGARH (UT), AND ANR.
.....RESPONDENTS**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Ms. Anita Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT) dated 29.01.2025 (Annexure P-1), by which claim raised by respondent No.2 that she was appointed on 11.09.2000 on compassionate ground and her services were regularized on 01.10.2000 and hence, she is entitled for the benefits of G.P.F. admissible to her keeping in view the benefit which was given by the Department of Telecommunication to its employees who were transferred to BSNL, has been accepted.
2. The reliance was placed by the respondent-employee upon the judgment passed in O.A. No.461 of 2020 titled as ***“Anju and others Vs. Union of India & others”***, which case also had similar facts as the present one.
3. The Tribunal, after considering the fact that the issue qua the claim raised by the respondent-employee herein was akin to the claim raised by another employee in O.A. No.461/2020, which matter also related to the BSNL, has granted the benefit in the same terms.
4. On being asked whether, the judgment in O.A. No.461/2020 has been assailed or not, learned counsel has not been able to show that the said judgment has not been complied with.
5. Once, a benefit has already been given to the respondent-employee, based upon the judgment passed in another case, where relief has

**CWP-15404-2025****-2-**

been given to a similarly situated employee raising similar claim under similar facts qua which order granting benefit to said employee has already been passed and implemented.

7. Further, as per the records, after the respondent-employee was regularized in services by the BSNL, for a period of 07 years, she was continued in her G.P.F. account and, it was thereafter, she was shifted to the PPF against which she filed the representation. Once the benefit of G.P.F. has been extended to all the employees who were appointed with the BSNL, denying the said benefit to the respondent-employee, who was concededly appointed when BSNL was yet to come into operation, coupled with the fact that in O.A. No.461/2020 (supra), the same benefit has been extended, during the same benefit to the respondent No.2 is not justifiable.

8. The act of the petitioner challenging the judgment passed in favour of respondent No.2, is by way of pick and choose method. Any benefit which stands extended to the similarly situated employee needed to be implemented qua the respondent no.2 as well and as the same was not being done by the respondent(s) themselves, the Tribunal has intervened to grant the same.

9. Further, no perversity in the order impugned has been brought to the notice of this Court, so as to seek interference. Hence, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court.

10. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

AUGUST 11, 2025
ANJAL

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