



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

**LPA-1151-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.04.2026**

AIRPORT AUTHORITY OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

SANJIV MALIK AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(S)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Vivek Singla, Advocate
for the applicants-appellants.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

CM-2810-LPA-2026 (delay in filing)

1. This application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act has been filed on behalf of the applicants-appellants seeking condonation of delay of 139 days in filing the instant appeal.

2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is ***allowed*** and delay of 139 days in filing the present appeal stands condoned.

CM-2811-LPA-2026 (delay in re-filing)

3. This application under Section 151 CPC has been filed on behalf of the applicants-appellants seeking condonation of delay of 15 days in re-filing the accompanying appeal.

4. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 15 days in re-filing the accompanying appeal stands condoned.

Main Case (O&M)

5. This appeal is by the Airport Authority of India (for short, 'AAI') questioning a judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 09.09.2025 passed in CWP No.6639 of 2017, whereby the writ Court has extended the benefit of medical amenities available to the employees of AAI to the Central Industrial Security Force (for short, '**CISF**') personnel deployed in the AAI.

6. The respondents are the employees of the CISF and are governed by the provisions of Central Industrial Security Force Rules, 2001 (for short, '**CISF Rules, 2001**'). Rule 62 of the CISF Rules, 2001 is relevant and is reproduced hereinafter:-

“62. Medical Facilities- Members of the force shall be entitled to the facilities of the Central Government Health Scheme and in places where these facilities are not available, they shall be governed by the Central Civil Services (Medical Attendant) Rules, 1944;

Provided that when they are deployed in a Public Sector Undertaking:-

(i) in a case where such Public Sector provides medical facilities to its employees, such members of the Force shall be entitled to avail such facilities free of charge; and

(ii) If such facilities are not available, the authorized medical attendant for such members of the Force will be as provided in Central Civil Services (Medical Attendant) Rules, 1944.”

7. It is not in dispute that the CISF personnel are deployed with the AAI, which is a Public Sector Undertaking (PSU). It is also undisputed that the Central Government Health Scheme (for short,

‘**CGHS**’) facilities are not available to the CISF personnel while they are working in the AAI.

8. It is clarified by the learned counsel for the appellants that there are some Airports, where such CGHS facilities are available but undisputedly in the present case, the Airport, where the respondents are deployed, CGHS facilities are not available.

9. It is in that context that the respondents asserted that they are entitled to some medical benefits as are provided in Central Civil Services (Medical Attendant) Rules, 1944 (for short, ‘**Rules of 1944**’).

10. Learned Single Judge has found substance in the contention, so advanced, and has allowed the writ petition by taking into consideration the affidavit filed in the proceedings before the learned Single Judge.

11. Learned counsel for the appellants, however, disputes the respondents’ entitlement to receive such benefits, relying upon the Circular issued by the AAI on 17.07.2018, whereby a ceiling has been imposed on the extent of medical benefits to be extended to CISF personnel.

12. We are not impressed by the stand taken by the appellants or by the Circular dated 17.07.2018, inasmuch as the respondents’ entitlement to receive medical benefits flows from Rule 62 of the CISF Rules, 2001. Once such benefits are found to be admissible in accordance with the Rules of 1944, they cannot be curtailed by a Circular issued by the AAI.

13. We therefore find no substance in the present appeal which accordingly fails and is *dismissed*.
14. All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

APRIL 27, 2026
Rahul Joshi

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether Reportable | Yes/No |