



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

227

CWP-15421-2024**Date of Decision: 17.02.2026**

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

...Petitioners

Versus

EX HAV RAMESHWAR DASS AND ANR

...Respondents

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

Present:- Ms. Geeta Singwal, Senior Panel Counsel, for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajat Chauhan, Advocate for
Ms. Jasneet Kaur, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 30.01.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal'), wherein the petitioners have been directed to grant service pension to respondent No.1 for the rank of Havildar w.e.f. 01.11.1999 for life.
2. Before proceeding further, the impugned order needs to be gone into and therefore, the same is reproduced hereunder:-

“Reply filed on behalf of the respondent be taken on record.

In this application, the impugned Order Annexure A-4 has been sought to be quashed and set aside allegedly being wrong and illegal, with further direction t the respondents to release service pension in the rank of Havildar, the last rank held by the applicant w.e.f. 01.11.1999 for life with all consequential benefits. Any other and further order as is deemed fit and proper in the given facts and circumstances of the case has also been sought to be passed.

On completion of the record, this application is listed today for hearing.

Learned counsel on both sides are in agreement that



the points in issue herein are squarely covered in favour of the applicant by a decision of this Bench in **OA No.1919 of 2016 titled Shaleash Goel Vs. Union of India and Other, decided on 08.11.2017.**

If that be so and the present is a case identical to that of **Shaleash Goel (supra)**, the applicant shall also be given similar benefits within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order along-with that passed by this Bench in **Shaleash Goel's case (supra)**, failing which together with interest @8% per annum from the date of this order.

Against the surviving grievance (s) if any, liberty to the applicant to approach this Tribunal again for redressal of the same.

This application is, accordingly, disposed of, so also application (s) if any, pending.”

- 3. A bare perusal of the above order would show that it was the petitioners, who had conceded before the Tribunal that the case is covered by the decision of the Tribunal in OA No.1919 of 2016, titled as ‘Shaleash Goel vs. Union of India and others’, decided on 08.11.2017 and upon the said agreement, the Original Application was disposed in the same terms.
- 4. Once the impugned order is a consented order, no ground is made out for any interference.
- 5. The writ petition is dismissed accordingly.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

February 17, 2026
harish

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No