



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

CWP-16361-2026

Date of decision : 22.05.2026

Union of India and others

...Petitioner

Vs.

Ramesh Chand and others

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Ms. Bhavana Datta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the benefit has been granted by the Tribunal to the respondents based upon the judgment passed in OA-3204-2011 titled as "*Madhu Sudan and others Vs. Union of India and others*", which is incorrectly granted.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners argued that the petitioners never raised any grievance and therefore, now allowing the benefit of the judgment in Madhu Sudan (supra) is incorrect.
3. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the record with her able assistance.
4. As per settled principle of law, once the question of law has been settled, the same should apply on all, rather than forcing every one to approach the Court to claim the same. A bare reading of the order passed by Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal would show that the benefit has been granted

to the respondents being similarly situated as original applicant in *Madhu Sudan* (supra). Once, the benefit claimed has been granted by the competent Court of law to the similarly situated employees and has been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the same extends not only to the party of the said proceedings but even to those who are similarly situated. As per the settled principle of law settled by the Supreme Court of India in ***LT.Col.Suprita Chandel Vs. Union of India and others, 2022***. The relevant paragraph from the judgment is reproduced hereunder:-

“14. It is a well settled principle of law that where a citizen aggrieved by an action of the government department has approached the Court and obtained a declaration of law in his/her favour, others similarly situated ought to be extended the benefit without the need for them to go to Court.”

5. In the present case, though the challenge has been raised, but on being asked to point out any differentiating fact between the respondents herein and the applicant in *Madhu Sudan*, learned counsel for the petitioners was unable to point out any differentiating facts.

6. In the absence of any differentiating facts, the relief granted to the respondents based upon the relief granted to the similarly situated employees in case of ***Madhu Sudan*** (supra), cannot be treated as arbitrary and rather, the Union of India should have granted the same relief to the respondents without forcing the respondents to seek the remedy by approaching this Court.

7. No other argument raised.

8. Hence, keeping in view of the above, no ground is made out for interference as the order passed by the authorities has not been able to prove perverse either on facts or on law.

9.
- The petition stands dismissed.
10.
- Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

22.05.2026
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No