



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
(Sr. No. 216)

(1) CWP-30839-2024
Date of Decision : 21.02.2025

Rajinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others ...Respondents

(2) CWP-1277-2025

Sukhwinder Pal Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others ...Respondents

(3) CWP-33960-2024

Tarsem Chand and others ...Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Arkash Mani Garg, Advocate for the petitioners
in CWP-30839-2024.

Mr. Sanjeev Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners
in CWP-33960-2024.

Mr. Rangat Joshi, Advocate for
Mr. A.S. Walia, Advocate for the petitioner in CWP-1277-2025.

Mr. Rajesh Hooda, Advocate
for the respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in CWP-30839-2024,



for respondents No. 2 and 3 in CWP-33960-2024 and
for respondents No. 2 and 3 in CWP-1277-2025.

Ms. Monika Sharma, Advocate for respondent No. 4
in CWP-1277-2025.

Mr. Mayank Mathur, Advocate for respondent No. 4
in CWP-33960-2024.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present bunch of petitions, the claim of the petitioners is that they are entitled for the grant of revised pension on the basis of the actual wages being drawn by them and the petitioners have already deposited their contribution and they were granted the commensurate pension but now, their pension is being reduced without any valid justification, which act on the part of the respondents is arbitrary and illegal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the similar issue came up for consideration before the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No. 5378 of 2024 titled as ***Inderjit Singh Kaknian and others Vs. Union of India and others***, decided on 12.09.2024 and other connected matters, where the same relief, as being sought by the present petitioners have already been allowed hence, the present petitions may kindly be disposed of in the same terms and conditions.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submit that though the issue raised in the present petitions is covered by the judgment passed in ***Inderjit Singh Kaknian's case (supra)*** but the department has decided to avail remedy of appeal against the said judgment



and till the LPA is decided, the present petitions may not be disposed of in terms of the judgment in *Inderjit Singh Kaknian's case (supra)*.

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

5. Once, it is a conceded that the issue raised in the present petitions is covered by the judgment in *Inderjit Singh Kaknian's case (supra)* merely that the respondents have decided to file an appeal against the said judgment is no ground not to grant the same benefit to the present petitioners. Nothing has been brought to the notice of this Court that the judgment, which is being relied by the petitioners has either been stayed or set-aside by the Division Bench. That being so, the present petitions are also disposed of in terms of *Inderjit Singh Kaknian's case (supra)*.

6. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected cases.

February 21, 2025
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No