



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

108

**CWP-19693-2025 (O&M)
Decided on :06.08.2025**

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS . . . Petitioners
Versus

EX SUB (Cik SD) JABAR SINGH AND ANOTHER . . . Respondents

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

PRESENT: Mr. Arihant Goyal, Advocate for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 21.07.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No. 2-Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh, by which, respondent No. 1-Jabar Singh has been held entitled to get revised pension under 'One Rank One Pension Scheme' (herein after referred to OROP Scheme) despite having retired on 30.09.2014 which date is after the notified cut-off date for applicability of the OROP Scheme i.e. 01.07.2014.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the benefit of revised pension under the OROP Scheme has been granted to respondent No. 1 by respondent No. 2 while passing the impugned order on the ground that he is entitled for the same pension as being given to the other employees who were holding the same rank and were similarly situated employees as respondent No. 1, but respondent No. 2 has not appreciated the fact that respondent no. 1 retired from service on 30.09.2014, i.e. after the implementation of OROP Scheme.

3. On being asked by this Court, as to why, respondent No. 1 who retired after the implementation of the OROP Scheme, which was implemented from 01.07.2014, but still he was getting lesser pension as

**CWP-19693-2025 (O&M)****-2-**

compared to the similarly situated employees, who retired from the same rank having similar service, learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to point out any differentiating fact.

4. Further, it may be noticed that while passing the impugned order dated 21.07.2023 (Annexure P-1), the Tribunal has only removed the disparity keeping in view the judgment of the Tribunal in OA No. 2861 of 2017, decided on 15.05.2023 and nothing has been brought to the notice of this Court to show that the claim of respondent No. 1 is not covered by the decision of the Tribunal in OA No. 2861 of 2017.

5. In the absence of any perversity being pointed out in the impugned order dated 21.07.2023 (Annexure P-1) either on the basis of the facts or the settled principle of law, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

7. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

06.08.2025

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*