



105

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

**CWP-36316-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 05.02.2026**

Baljit Singh and others

... Petitioners

Vs.

Union of India and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. A.S. Walia, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Samir Rathaur, Advocate
for respondents No.2 & 3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J.

1. Present petition has been preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing respondent No.3 to accept the application for validation of option/joint options for pension on higher wages and process the same for grant of higher pension. It is further prayed to issue a direction to accept the differential amount from the petitioners and also to release/grant arrears of revised pension.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, contends that the

2026:PHHC:017614



petitioners were serving the Punjab State Tubewell Corporation Ltd., Chandigarh (now Punjab Water Resources Management and Development Corporation Ltd., SAS Nagar, Mohali) and they were allotted Employees Provident Fund establishment Code No.PN/4690. On attaining the age of superannuation, the petitioners retired after 01.09.2014, on 30.05.2017, 29.04.2023 & 31.03.2018 respectively and as such, they are now pensioners under the Employees Pension Scheme, 1995 (for short 'EPS, 1995'). During their service, the petitioners contributed to Employees Provident Fund on actual wages exceeding the ceiling since 1974. Further, the aforesaid EPS, 1995 was amended in the year 2014, whereby the wage ceiling was enhanced from Rs.6500/- to Rs.15000/- and also allowed a joint option under para No.11(4) for pension on full salary. However, the petitioners were not informed regarding the aforesaid amendment, which deprived them of the opportunity to exercise the joint option in time.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon a judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***The Employees Provident Fund Organization and another Vs. Sunil Kumar B. and others, SLP(C) Nos.8658-8659 of 2019*** decided on 04.11.2022, pursuant to which, the petitioners became entitled to submit joint options for higher pension. However, when the petitioners attempted to submit joint options, till that time, online portal was closed. However, petitioner No.3 submitted offline documents on 28.02.2023, which were not considered by the respondent-EPFO. As such, the pension of

2026:PHHC:017614



the petitioners is restricted to Rs.15,000/- per month. Thereafter, the petitioners submitted representations on 04.08.2025 (Annexures P-5 to P-7), which remain unheeded.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners are ready to pay the differential contributions for their entitlement to higher pension under the EPS, 1995, as they are fully eligible. Further, eligibility of the petitioners is not in question.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondents No.2 & 3 submits that that the petitioners did not submit the joint options during their service tenure, therefore, they are not entitled to higher pension.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance.

7. The controversy involved in the present petition is no longer *res integra*, as this Court in **CWP-29633-2025** titled as ***Hazara Masih Vs. The Employees Provident Fund Organization and others***, decided on 09.10.2025 and **CWP-22555-2025** titled as ***Jagtar Singh and others Vs. Employee Provident Fund Organization and others***, decided on 11.12.2025, has already settled the issue.

8. In view of the above, present petition is allowed in terms of the judgment rendered by this Court in ***Jagtar Singh***'s case (*supra*) and ***Hazara Masih***'s case (*supra*). The respondent-EPFO is directed to issue the demand notice within a period of eight weeks from today. The petitioners are also



directed to deposit the differential amount, as per demand notice to be issued, within next eight weeks.

9. Thereafter, respondent-EPFO will process the case of the petitioners and grant them the benefit of higher pension, in terms of ***Jagtar Singh***'s case (*supra*) and ***Hazara Masih***'s case (*supra*).

10. The pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

05.02.2026
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No