



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

103

CWP-8885-2024

Date of Decision: 26.02.2026

DR SHEKHAR SHARMA

...Petitioner

Vs.

PANJAB UNIVERSITY AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Prabhdeep Singh Bindra, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate for respondent

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of communication dated 14.03.2024 whereby respondent has rejected his request to modify/change his spouse's name in the Pension Payment Order (for short 'PPO').

2. The petitioner has retired from Panjab University and at present is 86 years old. He solemnized second marriage after retirement. There is no dispute with respect to validity of said marriage. He requested respondent to modify his PPO to the extent of substitution of name of his spouse. The respondent has rejected his request.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that there is objection by administration on the ground that marriage was solemnized after retirement, thus, PPO cannot be amended.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.
5. The argument of respondent seems to be strange. The respondent is not disputing veracity of second marriage, thus, is bound to change name of petitioner's spouse in PPO. The dispute at the most could arise had employee passed away and spouse was seeking amendment in PPO.
6. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition deserves to be allowed and accordingly allowed. Impugned communication dated 14.03.2024 is hereby set aside and respondent is directed to change petitioner's spouse name in PPO, within four weeks from today.
7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

February 26, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No