

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

**222+223**

**Decided on : 09.02.2026**

**222            CWP-23265-2024 (O&M)**

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. .Petitioners

Versus

SATYAVART AND ANOTHER

. . . Respondents

**223            CWP-23840-2024 (O&M)**

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

. .Petitioners

Versus

EX HFO JAG MOHAN LAL GARG, AND ANR

. . . Respondents

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

PRESENT: Mr. Sushant Kareer, Advocate for the petitioner  
in CWP-23265-2024.

Mr. Ashish Chaudhary, Senior Panel counsel  
for the petitioners-UI in CWP No. 23840-2024.

Mr. Rajat Chauhan, Advocate for  
Ms. Jasneet Kaur, Advocate for respondent No. 1  
in CWP No. 23840-2024.

\*\*\*\*

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

1.            Both the present petitions, the details of which are mentioned in the heading, involve common point of law and common set of facts, hence, they are being dealt together. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from **CWP-23265-2024**.

2.            In the present petition, challenge is to the impugned order dated 05.04.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.2 -Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench Chandigarh (in short, 'the Tribunal') by which, respondent No.1 has been allowed the benefit of disability element of disability pension alongwith benefit of rounding off of the disability element

**CWP-23265-2024 (O&M) AND  
CONNECTED CASE**

of disability pension from 50 % to 75% for life, from the day next to the date of his discharge from service i.e.01.05.2021.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in CWP-23265-2024 places reliance upon the report of medical examination of the respondent No. 1 to contend that though the disability of “*Coronary Artery Disease Old Inferior Wall MI Moderate LV Dysfunction ICD D 15.1- Heart*” @ 50% for life has been found to be existing in respondent No.1, but the same was assessed as to be ‘neither attributable to Military Service nor aggravated by the Air Force’ and hence, the grant of benefit of disability pension to respondent No. 1 by placing reliance upon the judgment of Tribunal in **Dharamvir Singh vs. Union of India and others, (2013) 7 SCC 316** is arbitrary and illegal and even the benefit of rounding off of disability pension has been wrongly granted to respondent No. 1 in terms of **Union of India and others vs. Ram Avtar, 2014 SCC Online SC 1761.**

3.A. Learned counsel for the petitioners in CWP No. 23840 of 2024, argues that respondent No. 1 was detected ‘Coronary Artery Disease’ @ 30% for life but the same was neither attributable nor aggravated by the Air Force service and therefore grant of benefit is arbitrary and illegal.

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

5. In CWP-23265-2024, it is a conceded fact that at the time when respondent No.1 was discharged from service on 30.04.2021 he had already rendered more than 40 years of service with the petitioners-Union of India. It is also a conceded fact that at the time when respondent No. 1 joined the armed forces i.e. on 05.01.1981, he was medically examined and was found not to be suffering from any such disease and was found to be medically fit and at the time of his discharge, he was found to be suffering from disability of “*Coronary Artery Disease Old Inferior Wall MI Moderate LV Dysfunction ICD D 15.1- Heart*” @ 50% for life. The said fact had been made the basis by the Tribunal while granting benefit to the respondent No.1

**CWP-23265-2024 (O&M) AND  
CONNECTED CASE**

by placing reliance upon the judgment of in **Dharamvir Singh 's case (Supra) and Ram Avtar's case (Supra)**

6. Qua grievance of petitioners qua grant of benefit of disability element of disability pension to respondent No.1, It should be noted that as per judgment in **Dharamvir Singh vs. Union of India and others, (2013) 7 SCC 316** . in a case where army personnel is found to be fit at the time of enrolment, and has later been found to be contracted with a disease, same is presumed to have been contracted with during the time such personnel was rendering service in military and as such same is to be attributed to military service or be regarded as having been aggravated by military service. And the said presumption in favour of army personnel emerges from Rule 5 and 9 of the "Entitlement Rules for Causality Pensionary Awards, 1982", which gives the benefit of presumption of such in favour of army personnel. The relevant para Nos.30, 32 and 33 of the judgment in **Dharamvir Singh's case (supra)** are as under:-

*"30. In the present case it is undisputed that no note of any disease has been recorded at the time of appellant's acceptance for military service. The respondents have failed to bring on record any document to suggest that the appellant was under treatment for such a disease or by hereditary he is suffering from such disease. In absence of any note in the service record at the time of acceptance of joining of appellant it was incumbent on the part of the Medical Board to call for records and look into the same before coming to an opinion that the disease could not have been detected on medical examination prior to the*

**CWP-23265-2024 (O&M) AND  
CONNECTED CASE**

*acceptance for military service, but nothing is on the record to suggest that any such record was called for by the Medical Board or looked into it and no reasons have been recorded in writing to come to the conclusion that the disability is not due to military service. In fact, nonapplication of mind of Medical Board is apparent from Clause (d) of paragraph 2 of the opinion of the Medical Board, which is as follows:*

*“(d) In the case of a disability under C the board should state what exactly in their opinion is the cause thereof. YES Disability is not related to mil service”*

32. *In spite of the aforesaid provisions, the Pension Sanctioning Authority failed to notice that the Medical Board had not given any reason in support of its opinion, particularly when there is no note of such disease or disability available in the service record of the appellant at the time of acceptance for military service. Without going through the aforesaid facts the Pension Sanctioning Authority mechanically passed the impugned order of rejection based on the report of the Medical Board. As per Rules 5 and 9 of 'Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982', the appellant is entitled for presumption and benefit of presumption in his favour. In absence of any evidence on record to show that the appellant was suffering from "Generalised seizure (Epilepsy)" at the time of acceptance of his service, it will be presumed that the appellant was in sound physical and mental condition at the time of entering the service and deterioration in his health has taken place due to service.*
33. *As per Rule 423(a) of General Rules for the purpose of determining a question whether the cause of a disability or death resulting from disease is or is not attributable to service, it is immaterial whether the cause giving rise to the disability or*

**CWP-23265-2024 (O&M) AND  
CONNECTED CASE**

*death occurred in an area declared to be a field service/active service area or under normal peace conditions.*

*"Classification of diseases" have been prescribed at Chapter IV of Annexure I; under paragraph 4 post traumatic epilepsy and other mental changes resulting from head injuries have been shown as one of the diseases affected by training, marching, prolonged standing etc. Therefore, the presumption would be that the disability of the appellant bore a casual connection with the service conditions."*

7. Further, with regard to the grievance of petitioners qua the benefit of rounding off of disability granted to respondent No.1, the same issue has been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Union of India and others vs. Ram Avtar, 2014 SCC Online SC 1761**, wherein it has been held that an Armed Forces personnel is entitled to be granted the benefit of rounding off with regard to disability pension, irrespective of the fact that he was invalidated out of service, or retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of his tenure of his engagement, if found to be suffering from some disability which is attributable or aggravated by the Military service. Relevant paras of the judgment in **Ram Avtar's** case (supra) are as under:-

*"4. By the present set of appeals the appellant(s) raise the question, whether or not, an individual, who has retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of his tenure of engagement, if found to be suffering from some disability which is attributable to or aggravated by the military service, is entitled to be granted the benefit of rounding-off of disability pension. The appellant(s) herein would contend that, on the basis of Circular No. 1(2)/97/D(Pen-C) issued by the Ministry of Defence, Government of India, dated 31.01.2001, the aforesaid*

**CWP-23265-2024 (O&M) AND  
CONNECTED CASE**

*benefit is made available only to an Armed Forces Personnel who is invalidated out of service, and not to any other category of Armed Forces Personnel mentioned hereinabove.*

5. *We have heard learned counsel for the parties to the lis.*
6. *We do not see any error in the impugned judgment(s) and order(s) and therefore all the appeals which pertain to the concept of rounding-off of the disability pension are dismissed, with no order as to costs.*
7. *The dismissal of these matters will be taken note of by the High Courts as well as by the Tribunals in granting appropriate relief to the pensioners before them, if any, who are getting or are entitled to the disability pension.”*

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to dispute the said proposition of law having been settled by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in **Ram Avtar’s case (supra)** to the effect that percentage of disability is to be rounded off and in the present case, the disability of 50% is to be rounded off to 75% for life.

9. Further, in a recent judgment in **Civil Appeal No.11311 of 2025 titled as Union of India and others vs. Reet MP Singh and another, decided on 01.09.2025**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India by placing reliance upon **Ram Avtar’s case (supra)** as well as **Bijender Singh vs. Union of India and others, 2025 SCC Online SC 895**, has again reiterated that the benefit of rounding off the disability element so as to grant the disability pension cannot be denied.

10. Keeping in view the facts and circumstance of the present case as well as the settled principle of law settled in **Dharamvir Singh’s case**



**CWP-23265-2024 (O&M) AND  
CONNECTED CASE**

(supra), Ram Avtar's case (supra) as well as Reet MP Singh case (supra), once at the time of enrolment, respondent No.1 was medically examined and was found to be fit in all aspects and it was only during his service period that respondent No.1 was found to be suffering from disability of “*Coronary Artery Disease Old Inferior Wall MI Moderate LV Dysfunction ICD D 15.1-Heart*” @ 50% for life that being so, the said disability has to be attributed to the air force and the unsubstantiated report of Medical Board cannot take away the right of respondent No.1 to claim the benefit of disability pension and that too, by rounding off the disability from 50% to 75%.

11. Qua the grievance of the petitioners that the respondent No. 1 was discharged from service after completing the qualifying service or attaining the age of superannuation, it may be noticed that learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to dispute the fact that even if, the soldiers has attained the age of superannuation, but was found to be suffering from the disability which was attributable to the air force service, the disability pension is to be given to him, hence, merely that the respondent No. 1 had retired on attaining the age of superannuation will not take away the right of disability pension when the disability found in him at the time of superannuation is to be treated as attributable to or aggravated by the air force service as per the settled principle of law settled in Dharamvir Singh's case (supra). It is also a settled position of law that all the regulations governing the military service and stipulated herein are also applicable upon the Air Force service in accordance with the pension regulations.

12. No further arguments raised.

13. Hence, in the absence of any perversity being pointed out in the impugned order dated 05.04.2024 and 04.07.2023 (Annexure P-1),

**CWP-23265-2024 (O&M) AND  
CONNECTED CASE**

respectively, 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 cases and **the writ petitions are accordingly dismissed.**

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

15. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case(s).

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)  
JUDGE**

**(VIKAS SURI )  
JUDGE**

**09.02.2026**

*Riya*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:* Yes/~~No~~

*Whether Reportable:* ~~Yes~~/No