



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

122

**CWP-10850-2026 (O&M)
Decided on :09.04.2026**

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. .Petitioners

Versus

MAJOR PROMILA RETD

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

PRESENT: Mr.N. K. Verma, Senior Panel Counsel
for the petitioners-UOI.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Roopam Atwal, Advocate for the respondent.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, a challenge has been made to the impugned order dated 24.10.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as “the Tribunal”), whereby directions are issued to claim of the respondent on the basis of the policy dated 30.08.2006. .
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the said order order dated 24.10.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Tribunal is causing prejudice to the petitioners, as the disability suffered by the respondent is less than 20%.
3. Per contra, learned Senior Counsel for the respondent submits that the only direction issued by the Tribunal is to decide the claim of the applicant in terms of the policy dated 30.08.2006, which is very much clear and hence, instead of deciding the said claim, the petitioners have filed the present writ petition before this Court.

**CWP-10850-2026 (O&M)**

4. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

5 The impugned order dated 24.10.2024 passed by the Tribunal is as under:-

“Heard.

2. Prayer made by applicant in this case is for grant of service element in view of policy decision taken by Union of India on 30.08.2006 in this regard. Case of the applicant is to claim her relief in this case specific that she is asking for service element only and not for disability pension and as per this policy, she is entitled for service element as her disability was accepted as 06-10% for life. Union of India is not disputing this factual position of the case.

3. That being so, we dispose the present Original Application with a direction to Union of India to decide the case of the applicant in terms of aforesaid policy dated 30.08.2006 for grant her service element within a period three months from today. If her case is not decided within a period of three months, she shall be entitled to claim interest @ 8% per annum till its finalization.

4. Miscellaneous Applications (s) pending, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

5. No order so as to costs. ”

6. A bare perusal of the above order would show that the only direction is given by the Tribunal to decide the claim of the applicant/respondent in terms of the policy dated 30.08.2006.

7. Once, the only direction has been given by the Tribunal vide order dated 24.10.2024, raising a grievance before this court even against the said order is not maintainable. The petitioners are bound to decide the claim of the respondent in terms of the policy dated 30.08.2006.

8. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances, the

**CWP-10850-2026 (O&M)**

present petition is dismissed.

9. It may be noticed that in case, the claim of the respondent has not been decided by the petitioners, the same should be decided within the period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. The terms and conditions passed by the Tribunal vide order dated 24.10.2024 shall remain same qua the grant of interest.

10. Pending civil miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

09.04.2026

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: ~~Yes~~/No