



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

249

CWP-23628-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.01.2025

Tejinder Singh Sudan and Another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Yagsimant Attri, Advocate for
Mr. Rajinder Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer made in the present petition is for directing the respondents to grant of revised pension/family pension.
2. Learned State counsel has produced the copy of the judgment passed by this Court in **Parkash Chand Beri vs. State of Punjab and others**, CWP-11256-2021, decided on 14.11.2024, involving the same issue, as per which the present petition is liable to be dismissed, which the learned counsel for the petitioners is unable to controvert and draw out any distinctive aspects therefrom or cite any contrary law, the relevant paras whereof read thus:-

“xx xx xx

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

5. The only question to be decided in the present writ petitions is whether, the fixation of the pension of the petitioner at Rs.11,000/- is in consonance with the Clause 4.2 of the Instructions dated 17.08.2009 (Annexure P-1). Clause 4.2 is as under:

“ 4.2 The fixation of Pension will be subject to the provision that the revised pension, in no case, shall be lower than fifty percent of the minimum of the pay in the



pay band plus the grade pay corresponding to the pre-revised pay scale from which the pensioner had retired. This will be reduced pro-rata if the qualifying service of the person falls short of 33 years.

5. By applying the said clause, on the pay scale of Rs.15,600- 39100/- + 5400 Grade Pay, the petitioner is entitled for minimum of pension as Rs.10,500/- whereas, the petitioner is already being granted the pension of Rs.11,000/- which is more than 50% of the minimum of the pay scale + grade pay.

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

7. Keeping in view the above that the pension of the petitioner is in consonance with Clause 4.2, hence, no further order is required to be passed in the present writ petitions.

8. The present writ petitions are disposed of in above terms.

9. Civil miscellaneous application pending if any, also stands disposed of.

10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.”

3. Dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

08.01.2025
M.Kamra

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