

**CWP-14732-2024**

**1**

**234+235+236**

2026:PHHC:050477-DB



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

**Date of decision : 01.04.2026**

**1. CWP-14732-2024**

**Union of India and others**

**...Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**No.14925722-K Ex.Havildar Surender  
Sharma and another**

**...Respondent(s)**

**2. CWP-15173-2024**

**Union of India and others**

**...Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**Ex.Sepoy Paramjit Singh and another**

**...Respondent(s)**

**3. CWP-15177-2024**

**Union of India and others**

**...Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**No.13695736M Ex.Naik Mool Chand  
and another**

**...Respondent(s)**

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

**Present:** Ms. Geeta Singhwal, Advocate  
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sharma, Advocate  
for the respondents in CWP-14732-2024.

None for the respondents in CWP-15173-2024 and  
CWP-15177-2024.

\*\*\*

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(Oral)**

This order shall dispose of three writ petitions i.e.CWP-14732-2024, CWP-15173-2024 and CWP-15177-2024 as the issues involved in these cases are same. For reference, facts have been taken from CWP-14732-2024.

2. In CWP-14732-2024, the challenge is to the order passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal by which, the benefit of disability pension has been granted by rounding off the disability of 70% to 75%.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that though the accident occurred while the respondent was availing casual leave, which is to be treated on duty, but the said accident cannot be made attributable to the military service and therefore, the grant of the disability pension on the basis of the injury suffered in such accident, is incorrect.

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

5. It may be noticed that the respondent was on casual leave from 12.07.2004 to 24.07.2004 and he sustained the said injury on 15.07.2004. Thereafter, for another period of 15 years, the respondent worked before he was discharged.

6. Even, if it is assumed for the sake of argument that the injury so suffered is not attributable to the military service, but a person working for 15 years with the injury, can result definitely for aggravating the said injury so that the respondent is entitled for the grant of disability pension.

7. Keeping in view the said fact, the respondent has rightly been granted the benefit of disability pension, by treating the said injury being

aggravated by the military service rather than being attributable to the military service as, any injury aggravated by the military service also entitle the disability pension. Hence, the grant of disability pension by the Tribunal by rounding of the disability to 75%, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, cannot be treated as perverse either on facts or on law so as to seek any interference by this Court.

- 8. The petition(s) stands dismissed.
- 9. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.
- 10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case(s).

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)  
JUDGE

01.04.2026  
vanita

|                             |     |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned : | Yes |
| Whether Reportable :        | No  |