



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

CWP-12746-2025

Date of decision: 27.03.2026

ROSHAN LAL AHUJA

....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNAJB AND ANR

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present: - Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Ms. Shubhreet Kaur Saron, Advocate
for respondent No.2- High Court.

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

1. The present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, has been filed for issuance of writ, order or direction, especially in the nature of certiorari, for quashing the impugned proceedings dated 15.12.2021 (Annexure P-24), impugned order dated 26.04.2022 (Annexure P-25) and the impugned minutes of meeting dated 23.11.2022 (Annexure P-27) passed by respondent No.2, whereby the claim of the petitioner with regard to payment of pension and other retiral benefits by placing him under Old Pension Scheme has been declined.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute that the prayer clause contained in Clause (a) (ii) and (iii) stands satisfied by issuance of the order by this High Court on 19.03.2026.

3. However, it is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that, as regards other allowances as contained in the prayer clause, there has been no direction.



4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2- High Court, by referring to the reply of the petitioner, submits that the said issue relates to the State of Punjab.
5. However, whether a particular allowance is due to a particular Judicial Officer is required to be considered by the High Court, especially when it pertains to the recommendations of the Ist National Judicial Pay Commission, as approved by the Apex Court. In this regard, the petitioner has relied upon Annexure P-12 and Annexure P-13 dated 18.05.2006 and 12.05.2011 respectively.
6. Accordingly, this petition stands disposed of with direction to the High Court to consider the claim for additional allowances on the anvil of the recommendations of Ist National Judicial Pay Commission.
7. Let the case of the petitioner be considered within a period of 60 days by passing a speaking order and communicating the same to the petitioner. In case the petitioner is found entitled to the claim, the same be paid failing which reasons be assigned for declining the claim.
8. Disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

27.03.2026

kanika

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE