



211

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

**CWP-4436-2020(O&M)
Date of decision : 19.03.2026**

Satish Kumar Bhardwaj

...Petitioner

Versus

Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH
NALWA**

Present: Mr. Kehar Singh Hissowal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Indreesh Goel, Advocate for the respondents.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to restore the family pension to the petitioner.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was married to one Jaya Devi Sood who was working on the post of Deputy Registrar at Panjab University, Chandigarh (hereinafter to be referred as 'the University'). Unfortunately, the wife of the petitioner expired on 20.01.2008 while in service. The petitioner was granted the benefit of family pension as per the Rules. It transpires that the petitioner re-married in the year 2010. The marriage certificate is attached with the reply dated 03.02.2023 filed by the respondents as Annexure R-2. Taking into consideration the relevant rules, family pension granted to the petitioner was stopped by the University. The petitioner filed



various representations, however, no action was taken by the University. As a consequence thereof, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that as the petitioner was granted family pension w.e.f. 21.01.2008 to 09.01.2010, as such, there was no reason for the University to stop the family pension on account of re-marriage of the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents-University submits that the petitioner was granted the benefit of family pension as per the Punjab Civil Services Rules (hereinafter to be referred as 'the Rules'). He submits that as per Rule 6.17 (4) (i) (a) of the Rules, as applicable to the University, family pension is admissible up to the date of re-marriage. As the petitioner has re-married on 10.01.2010, as such, in light of the abovesaid Rules, the petitioner is not entitled for grant of family pension.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the paper-book along with records.

6. The only issue involved in the present writ petition is whether the petitioner is entitled for restoration of family pension.

7. A perusal of the facts of the case would show that it is an admitted fact that the petitioner has re-married in the year 2010. In regard to grant of family pension to the petitioner is concerned, as per Rule 6.17 (4) (i) (a) of the Rules, husband of the deceased employee is



entitled for grant of family pension upto death or re-marriage. The relevant extract from Rule 6.17 (4) (i) (a) is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“(4) The pension will be admissible-

(i) (a) in the case of a widow or widower up to the date of death or remarriage whichever is earlier;”

8. A perusal of the above extracted rule would show that the husband of the deceased employee would be entitled for family pension upto the date of re-marriage. As the petitioner has re-married in the year 2010, the petitioner is not entitled for grant of family pension as per the abovesaid Rule.

9. Taking into consideration the facts of the present case and the relevant Rules, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

10. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present writ petition, the same is dismissed.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of.

19.03.2026

d.gulati

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :

Yes

No

Whether Reportable :

Yes

No