


**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****113****CWP-13539-2026****DATE OF DECISION: 11.05.2026****AYUB IMRAN BAIG EX SEPOY/DRIVER****...Petitioner****Versus****UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS****... Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Arun Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel
for the respondent-Union of India.**********HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)**

Challenge in the present petition is to order dated 19.03.2026 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal Chandigarh Bench (for short – the ‘Tribunal’) by which the original application of the petitioner has been dismissed in limine and further for quashing of the order dated 12.02.2026 (Annexure P-12) vide which the termination order of the petitioner has been passed under Army Act Section 20 read with Army Rule 17 for contracting plural marriage.

2. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at the time of the dismissal of petitioner from the services on account of having contracted more than one marriage, he already had 14 years of service to his credit and accordingly after granting the entitled condonation, the petitioner becomes entitled for the grant of pensionary benefits on completion of 15 years of qualifying service, hence, the dismissal should be treated as discharge so that the petitioner can get the benefits entitled as there is no other charge/allegation of



misconduct against the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-UOI submits that in case any such request is made by the petitioner, the same will be considered by the competent authority and an appropriate order will be passed and in case, it is found feasible to grant the said relief, the same will be granted, otherwise due reasons will be mentioned for not accepting the claim and such speaking order will be passed within a period of eight weeks from the date of the receipt of such representation by passing an appropriate speaking order.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the statement of learned counsel for the respondent-UOI, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to file a representation.

6. Ordered accordingly.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
sapna adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No