



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

212

CWP-421-2021**Date of Decision: 25.03.2026**

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

...Petitioners

Versus

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AND ANR

...Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Vishal Garg, Senior Panel Counsel, for the petitioners.
Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 15.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.1-Central Administrative Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (in short, 'the Tribunal'), by which the Original Application has been allowed.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that though the last paragraph of the impugned order dated 15.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) shows that the "Original Application is allowed in above terms", but the contentions noticed in paragraphs 7 to 9 show that the contentions raised on behalf of the respondents (petitioners herein) were being agreed to by the Tribunal. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that though the Original Application was being allowed but nothing has been mentioned as to what relief has been granted and from which date, the benefit is being extended, which clearly shows that the order passed by the Tribunal is vague.



- 3.Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that once the Original Application was being allowed, the prayer raised is treated to be accepted and therefore, the writ petition may kindly be dismissed.
- 4.We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.
- 5.In case the words used in the impugned order would have been that “the Original Application is allowed”, then it could be inferred that the prayer raised in the Original Application was allowed but in the present case, the words used are that “the Original Application is allowed in above terms” but the term “above term” does not decide or disclose that how the Original Application is being allowed especially when the averments made on behalf of the respondents (petitioners herein) was being accepted by the Tribunal.
- 6.Keeping in view the fact that the judgment is not clear, the order dated 15.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Tribunal is set aside and the case is remanded back to the Tribunal for fresh adjudication. The parties are directed to appear before the Tribunal on 20.04.2026.
- 7.Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

March 25, 2026

harish

Whether speaking/reasonedYes
Whether reportableNo