



CWP-27766-2024

1

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

(224)

CWP-27766-2024

Date of Decision : November 18, 2025

Union of India and others

..Petitioners

Versus

Ex. Sep Rup Singh and another

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present: Mr. Ashish Chaudhary, Senior Panel Counsel,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Senior Advocate, with
Ms. Roopan Atwal, Advocate and
Mr. Rajat Chauhan, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 23.09.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.2-Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal') by which, respondent No.1 has been allowed the benefit of disability pension by rounding off the disability element from 30% to 50% for life on the ground that the same is perverse.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners places reliance upon the report of medical examination of respondent No. 1 to contend that though the disability of '*Cataract Rt Eye (Optd) with Posterior Subcapsular Cataract Lt Eye @ 30% for life*' has been found in respondent No.1 but the said disability has been held to be 'neither attributable to nor aggravated by the Military service'. Hence, the grant of benefit of disability pension to respondent No.1 by rounding off of the disability @ 50% as against 30% for life by the Tribunal by placing reliance upon the judgment of in ***Union of***



CWP-27766-2024

2

India and others vs. Ram Avtar, 2014 SCC Online SC 1761 and *Dharamvir Singh vs. Union of India and others, (2013) 7 SCC 316* is incorrect.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

4. It is conceded fact that respondent No.1 was enrolled in Indian Army (Mahar Regiment) on 08.10.1980 and discharged on 31.10.1997 under the provisions of Army Rules after rendering 17 years and 24 days of service. It is also a conceded fact that thereafter, the respondent No.1 re-enrolled in Defence Service Corps (DSC) on 30.09.1998 and was discharged on 30.09.2008. It is also a conceded fact that at the time when respondent No.1 discharged from service on 30.09.2008, he had already rendered more than 10 years of service with the petitioners-Union of India. It is also a conceded fact that at the time when respondent No. 1 joined the armed forces on 08.10.1980, he was medically examined and was found not to be suffering from any such disease on the basis of which he has been allowed the benefit of disability pension and the said fact has been made the basis by the Tribunal while granting benefit to the respondent No.1 by placing reliance upon *Dharamvir Singh's case (supra)*.

5. It should be noted that as per judgment in *Dharamvir Singh's case (supra)* in a case where army personnel is found to be fit at the time of enrolment, and has later found to be contracted with a disease, same is presumed to have been aggravated by and attributable to Military service. The relevant para Nos.30, 32 and 33 of the judgment in *Dharamvir Singh's case (supra)* are as under:-



30. *In the present case it is undisputed that no note of any disease has been recorded at the time of appellant's acceptance for military service. The respondents have failed to bring on record any document to suggest that the appellant was under treatment for such a disease or by hereditary he is suffering from such disease. In absence of any note in the service record at the time of acceptance of joining of appellant it was incumbent on the part of the Medical Board to call for records and look into the same before coming to an opinion that the disease could not have been detected on medical examination prior to the acceptance for military service, but nothing is on the record to suggest that any such record was called for by the Medical Board or looked into it and no reasons have been recorded in writing to come to the conclusion that the disability is not due to military service. In fact, non-application of mind of Medical Board is apparent from Clause (d) of paragraph 2 of the opinion of the Medical Board, which is as follows:*

“(d) In the case of a disability under C the board should state what exactly in their opinion is the cause thereof. YES Disability is not related to mil service”

32. *In spite of the aforesaid provisions, the Pension Sanctioning Authority failed to notice that the Medical Board had not given any reason in support of its opinion, particularly when there is no note of such disease or disability available in the service record of the appellant at the time of acceptance for military service. Without going through the aforesaid facts the Pension Sanctioning Authority mechanically passed the impugned order of rejection based on the report of the Medical Board. As per Rules 5 and 9 of 'Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982', the*



appellant is entitled for presumption and benefit of presumption in his favour. In absence of any evidence on record to show that the appellant was suffering from "Generalised seizure (Epilepsy)" at the time of acceptance of his service, it will be presumed that the appellant was in sound physical and mental condition at the time of entering the service and deterioration in his health has taken place due to service.

33. As per Rule 423(a) of General Rules for the purpose of determining a question whether the cause of a disability or death resulting from disease is or is not attributable to service, it is immaterial whether the cause giving rise to the disability or death occurred in an area declared to be a field service/active service area or under normal peace conditions.

"Classification of diseases" have been prescribed at Chapter IV of Annexure I; under paragraph 4 post traumatic epilepsy and other mental changes resulting from head injuries have been shown as one of the diseases affected by training, marching, prolonged standing etc. Therefore, the presumption would be that the disability of the appellant bore a casual connection with the service conditions."

6. Further, with regard to the grievance of petitioners qua the 'rounding off of disability pension' the same issue has been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Union of India and others vs. Ram Avtar***, 2014 SCC Online SC 1761, wherein it has been held that any officer serving in the Armed Forces, who had undergone the medical examination at the time of his/her enrolment and was found fit, is subsequently found to be suffering with a disability, is entitled to the benefit of disability pension by rounding off the same as the presumption would be in favour of such employee, that the disability suffered during the service is attributable to the



CWP-27766-2024

5

Military service. Relevant paras of the judgment in **Ram Avtar's** case (supra) are as under:-

“4. By the present set of appeals the appellant(s) raise the question, whether or not, an individual, who has retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of his tenure of engagement, if found to be suffering from some disability which is attributable to or aggravated by the military service, is entitled to be granted the benefit of rounding-off of disability pension. The appellant(s) herein would contend that, on the basis of Circular No. 1(2)/97/D(Pen-C) issued by the Ministry of Defence, Government of India, dated 31.01.2001, the aforesaid benefit is made available only to an Armed Forces Personnel who is invalidated out of service, and not to any other category of Armed Forces Personnel mentioned hereinabove.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties to the lis.

6. We do not see any error in the impugned judgment(s) and order(s) and therefore all the appeals which pertain to the concept of rounding-off of the disability pension are dismissed, with no order as to costs.

7. The dismissal of these matters will be taken note of by the High Courts as well as by the Tribunals in granting appropriate relief to the pensioners before them, if any, who are getting or are entitled to the disability pension.”

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to dispute the said proposition of law having been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme

Court of India in **Dharamvir Singh's case (supra)** and **Ram Avtar's case**



CWP-27766-2024

6

(supra) to the extent that the disability element is to be rounded off and in the present case, the disability of 30% is to be rounded off to 50%.

8. Further, in a recent judgment in ***Civil Appeal No.11311 of 2025 titled as Union of India and others vs. Reet MP Singh and another, decided on 01.09.2025***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by placing reliance upon ***Union of India and others vs. Ram Avtar, 2014 SCC Online SC 1761*** as well as ***Bijender Singh vs. Union of India and others, 2025 SCC Online SC 895***, has again reiterated that the benefit of rounding off the disability element cannot be denied.

9. As far the grievance of petitioners that respondent No.1 is already a recipient of pension of his first spell of Army service, hence, the service element of pension that has been granted to respondent No.1 is incorrect.

10. Further, with regards to the grievance raised that the respondent No.1 had served in the DSC for 10 years and is not entitled for the disability pension, it is relevant to refer to a verdict rendered by the learned Tribunal concerned in case ***Original Application No.324 of 2016 titled as Om Parkash Guleria Vs. Union of India and others, decided on 10.08.2018***, wherein a similar question was put forth before the Tribunal concerned, that 'whether the applicant who was in receipt of army pension at the time of his re-enrollment in the DSC, is entitled to the disability pension in the DSC service also?' The learned Tribunal concerned after considering the relevant regulations observed that in terms of Regulation 179 of the Pension Regulations for the Army, 1961, the applicant was entitled to disability pension consisting of service element as well as disability



CWP-27766-2024

7

element. Further, the Tribunal also observed that the mere fact that the applicant was in receipt of pension of his first spell of Army service does not dis-entitle him to become an able recipient of the component of disability pension thus for the second spell of service in the DSC. The said verdict was challenged by the Union of India before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the same was upheld by the Apex Court in its verdict rendered in case titled as ***Union Of India & Ors. Vs. Om Prakash Guleria, decided on 27.08.2021, to which Civil Appeal No. (Diary No. 9346 of 2021)*** became assigned. The relevant paragraphs, as occur in the said verdict are extracted hereinafter.

“2. Besides the delay of 515 days in filing the appeal, which has not been satisfactorily explained, even on merits, we find no error in the judgment dated 10 August 2021 of the Armed Forces Tribunal. The Tribunal has correctly construed the provisions of the pension regulations and the ultimate conclusion, entitling the respondent to the service element of the disability pension and the benefit of rounding off, does not suffer from any error.

3. The Civil Appeal is, therefore, dismissed on the ground of delay as well as on merits.”

11. Keeping in view the facts and circumstance of the present case as well as the settled principle of law settled in ***Dharamvir Singh's case (supra)***, ***Ram Avtar's case (supra)*** as well as ***Reet M.P. Singh's case (supra)*** and ***Om Prakash Guleria (supra)***, once at the time of enrolment, respondent No. 1 was medically examined and was found to be fit in all respects and it was only during his service period that respondent No.1 was found to be suffering from 'Cataract Operated'. That being so, the said



CWP-27766-2024

8

disability has to be attributed to the military service and the unsubstantiated report of Medical Board cannot take away the right of respondent No.1 to claim the benefit of disability pension and that too, by rounding off the disability as per the settled principle of law settled in ***Ram Avtar's case (supra)***.

12. Hence, in the absence of any perversity being pointed out in the impugned order dated 23.09.2019 (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 and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

13. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

November 18, 2025
harsha

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No