



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

104+219**CM-17482-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-23068-2024****Date of Decision : 16.03.2026****JC EX Sub Soma Singh****....Petitioner****Versus****Union of India and others**

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

Present: Mr. Balwinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rohit Verma, Senior Panel Counsel
for respondents No.1 to 10.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

CM-17482-CWP-2025

This is an application under Section 151 CPC for placing on record the reply on behalf of respondents No.1 to 10.

For the reasons mentioned in the application supported by affidavit, the same is allowed and the reply is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CWP-23068-2024

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 21.05.2024 (Annexure P-17) passed by respondent No.11 – Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Tribunal), by which, the claim raised at the hands of the petitioner for the



*CM-17482-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-23068-2024*

-: 2 :-

grant of Honorary commission to the rank of Lieutenant on 15.08.2014 and later Honorary Captain on 26.10.2015, has been rejected.

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that non-grant of the said benefit is incorrect as, the petitioner fulfilled all the requisites of the grant of the benefit in question and therefore, the order dated 21.05.2024 (Annexure P-17) passed by the Tribunal not accepting the said claim, may kindly be set aside.

3. Learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 10 submits that the claim of the petitioner was considered twice for the grant of the Honorary commission to the rank of Lieutenant on Independence Day 2014, and thereafter, to the rank of Honorary Captain in the year 2015 but, there were other candidates who were more meritorious than the petitioner, who were granted the said benefit and therefore, the order dated 21.05.2024 (Annexure P-17) passed by the Tribunal rejecting the said claim is perfectly valid and legal.

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

5. It is a conceded position that the number of Honorary ranks to be given in a particular year are limited and the same is to be done based upon the merit of the officers being considered for the grant of such benefit. It is also a conceded position that for the year 2014 as well as 2015, the claim of the petitioner was considered but he was not found meritorious enough keeping in view the rank to be given to the limited number of officers. That being so, the said action has not been proved to be perverse either on facts or on law.



**CM-17482-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-23068-2024**

-: 3 :-

6. Even otherwise, in case the claim of the petitioner is to be accepted, one officer, who has already been granted the benefit 10 years ago and has retired, he is liable to be withdrawn which cannot be done as such officer is not party to the present litigation.

7. No other argument has been raised.

8. Hence, in the absence of any perversity being pointed out in the impugned order dated 21.05.2024 (Annexure P-17) either on the basis of the facts or the settled principle of law, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

10. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

**(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE**

March 16, 2026

Varinder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No