



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: 06.03.2026

110

CWP-6605-2026

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

...Petitioners

Versus

PARAMJIT SINGH AND ANR

...Respondents

112

CWP-6649-2026

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

...Petitioners

Versus

EX NAIK BUDHI SINGH AND ANR

...Respondents

117

CWP-6698-2026

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

...Petitioners

Versus

EX NK RUP SINGH AND ANR

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present:- Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Senior Panel Counsel,
for the petitioners in all cases.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. By this order, we propose to dispose of CWP-6605-2026,
CWP-6649-2026 and CWP-6698-2026 by a common order as the issue
involved in these writ petition is the same. With the consent of learned



counsel for the petitioners and for the sake of convenience, facts are being taken from CWP-6605-2026.

2. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure P-1), passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal'), by which, directions were given to the Union of India (petitioners herein) to grant benefit of service pension for DSC service to respondent No.1 by considering his service as 15 complete years by condoning shortfall of 339 days in qualifying service period for grant of benefit of service pension as per the judgment in Original Application No.1238 of 2016 with MA No.923 of 2016 decided on 01.10.2019 titled ***Smt. Shama Kaur vs. Union of India and others***, which judgment has also been implemented.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that when the said judgment was relied upon at a later point of time by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court so as to grant benefit of condonation of delay, on an appeal preferred by the Union of India against the said order passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, an interim order of stay has been passed and therefore, till the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (C) No.27725-2024 is passed, the operation of the impugned order passed by the Tribunal granting the relief of condonation of shortfall in qualifying service period to the respondent may kindly be stayed.

4. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

5. It is a conceded fact that after being discharged from Army service, respondent No.1 was re-enrolled in Defence Security Corps (DSC)



for second service on 05.05.2007 and was discharged from DSC on 31.05.2021 after rendering 14 years and 26 days of service having shortfall of 339 days to qualify the term of 15 years for the grant of service pension qua service rendered in DSC.

6. The issue which has been raised is that whether, the benefit of condonation of shortfall in qualifying service to the extent of 12 months so as to make the respondent No.1 eligible for the grant of second service pension can be granted in favour of an officer, who had retired from service prior to the completion of 15 years of service, completion of which period is a condition precedent for grant of such benefit. The prayer of the petitioners is that since respondent No.1 is claiming the benefit of second service pension for the service he rendered in the Defense Security Corps (DSC) for a period of more than 14 years, wherein, completion of 15 years in service is a condition precedent for grant of second service pension, which condition was not fulfilled hence, the said benefit granted to respondent No.1 may kindly be denied.

7. It may be noticed that the said issue came up for consideration before the Principal Bench of the Armed Force Tribunal in ***Shama Kaur's case (supra)***, wherein the benefit of condonation of the shortfall in completion of qualifying service period upto a period of 12 months was allowed, which judgment has already attained finality and the same benefit had been extended in ***Shama Kaur*** (supra).

8. Though, at a later point of time, the same judgment was relied upon by the Delhi High Court while deciding a bunch of writ petitions including Writ Petition (C) No.2986 of 2024 decided on 04.09.2024 titled



Union of India and others vs. EX/NK Chinna Vedyappan, wherein, the reliance was also placed on ***Shama Kaur's case (supra)*** for purpose of condonation of shortfall in completion of qualifying service period, and on an appeal preferred by UOI before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (C) No.27725-2024, titled ***Union of India and others vs. Ex. NK Chinna Vedyappan***, vide order dated 02.12.2024, the direction has been given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India not to implement the said order passed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court.

9. Now question which arises for consideration is that whether the present petition is also liable to be adjourned so as to await the said decision or, the adjudication of the writ petition filed by the petitioners can be undertaken.

10. It is relevant to mention here that as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Union Territory of Ladakh and others vs. Jammu and Kashmir National Conference and another, 2023 SCC Online SC 1140***, the following observations have been made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India:

“35. We are seeing before us judgments and orders by High Courts not deciding cases on the ground that the leading judgment of this Court on this subject is either referred to a larger Bench or a review petition relating thereto is pending. We have also come across examples of High Courts refusing deference to judgments of this Court on the score that a later Coordinate Bench has doubted its correctness. In this regard, we lay down the position in law. We make it absolutely clear that the High Courts will proceed to decide matters on the basis of the law as it stands. It is not open, unless specifically directed by this Court, to await an outcome of a reference or a



review petition, as the case may be. It is also not open to a High Court to refuse to follow a judgment by stating that it has been doubted by a later Coordinate Bench. In any case, when faced with conflicting judgments by Benches of equal strength of this Court, it is the earlier one which is to be followed by the High Courts, as held by a 5-Judge Bench in National Insurance Company Limited v Pranay Sethi, (2017) 16 SCC 6805. The High Courts, of course, will do so with careful regard to the facts and circumstances of the case before it.”

11. A bare perusal of the above would show that merely because one matter is pending adjudication before the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India, the law that has already been settled on the said issue on an earlier occasion cannot be ignored and same has to be given due consideration while adjudicating the claim.

12. Further, the learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to dispute the fact that in ***EX/NK Chinna VEDIYAPPAN’S case (supra)*** passed by the Hon’ble Delhi High Court, the benefit of condonation of shortfall in service was granted even to the officers, who had sought more than one year of service to be condoned to get the pensionary benefits, which was not the case in ***Shama Kaur’s case (supra)*** or even in the present petition. Hence, the issue pending for adjudication before the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India, which has been made the basis by petitioners for keeping the present petition in abeyance is that whether the benefit of condonation of shortfall in service beyond one year can be granted or not, so as to grant the pension which issue does not exist in the present petition.

13. The learned counsel for the petitioners has conceded the fact that the issue raised in the present petition was decided in favour of



respondent No.1 on the basis of the judgment in *Shama Kaur's case (supra)*, wherein the similar relief had already been granted to the claimants and which judgment has already attained finality upon Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and the said judgment stands implemented. Once the issue in present case is identical to one which has been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, which fact has gone unrebutted, merely waiting for the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (C) No. 27725-2024 so as to decide upon the issue in present case, will not serve any purpose especially in view of the law laid down in *Union Territory of Ladakh's case (supra)*. Once, the factual assertion that the claim of the respondent is covered by *Shama Kaur's case (supra)*, is not disputed, no ground is made out for keeping the present petition in abeyance for adjudication.

14. Further, the Coordinate Bench of this Court while deciding CWP-8886-2025 decided on 24.04.2025 titled *Union of India and others vs. Ex. Naik Kuldeep Singh*, after noticing the said fact, have decided the claim based upon *Shama Kaur's case (supra)*, wherein also, the fact that the same was covered by *Shama Kaur's case (supra)*, could not be rebutted.

15. No other argument has been raised.

16. Keeping in view the totality of the circumstances as well as the settled principle of law as noticed hereinbefore, as it has not been shown that the order dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure P-1) in CWP-6605-2026; order dated 17.05.2023 (Annexure P-1) in CWP-6649-2026; and order dated 24.03.2023 (Annexure P-1) in CWP-6698-2026 passed by the Tribunal is perverse either to the facts on record or settled principle of law, no interference at the hands



of this Court is needed.

- 17. The present writ petitions are dismissed accordingly.
- 18. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of connected cases.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

March 06, 2026
harish

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No