



2026:PHHC:062934



2026:PHHC:062934

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

CWP-12563-2026**Date of Decision : 24.04.2026****UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS****.....Petitioners****VERSUS****SUBEDAR DESH RAJ****.....Respondent**

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

Present: Mr. N.K Verma, Advocate for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, challenge is to the impugned order dated 22.03.2022 (Annexure P-1) passed by the respondent No.1-Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'), by which, the respondent has been held entitled for the grant of service pension after condoning the shortfall of service equivalent to 01 year and 65 days.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submit that the issue raised in the present petition with regard to the grant of benefit of condonation of service so as to consider the service of the officer concerned to the minimum of 15 years, which is the qualifying service required for the grant of service pension, disability pension including the family pension as the case may be, has already been decided by the Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India while passing judgment in *Union of India and others Versus Balakrishnan Mullikote (Ex.HAV 256812 M) Civil Appeal arising out of Diary No.27446 of 2023, decided on 24.03.2026.*



3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the case file with hi able assistance.

4. Keeping in view the facts mentioned hereinbefore that issue raised in this petition is covered by the judgment in ***Balakrishnan Mullikote's case (supra)***, the present petition is dismissed in the same terms and conditions as held in ***Balakrishnan Mullikote's case (supra)***.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

24-04-2026
Sapna Goyal

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/ reasoned: YES
Whether reportable: NO