



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

130

CWP-25970-2025

Date of Decision: 02.09.2025

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

SMT REENA YADAV AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Narender Kumar Vashist, Senior Panel Counsel,
for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order dated 03.12.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by the passed by respondent No. 2-Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'), by which, the benefit of special family pension has been allowed in favour of respondent No.1.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that after the death of the husband of respondent No.1 on duty on 19.08.2017 due to *Myocardial Infarction*, the authority has found that the cause of death is neither attributable to nor aggravated by the military service, the grant of benefit by the Tribunal is incorrect.

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

4. A bare perusal of the averments made by the counsel for the petitioners and the record brought before this Court would show that after



the death of husband of respondent No.1, the Court of Inquiry was conducted and as per the Court of Inquiry, it has already been held that the death of husband of respondent No.1 is attributable to the military service. Once the said finding has been recorded by the Court of Inquiry, any other authority concerned could not have denied the benefit of special family pension to respondent No.1 on the ground that the death of husband of respondent No.1 was not attributable to the military service. Establishing this fact that death was attributed to military service in a Court of Inquiry is good enough to grant the special family pension which has rightly been taken into consideration by the Tribunal to grant the benefit to respondent No.1.

5. No other argument has been raised.

6. Keeping in view the totality of the circumstances and in the absence of any perversity being pointed out in the impugned order dated 03.12.2019 (Annexure P-1) either on the basis of the facts on record 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.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

September 02, 2025

harish

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes

Whether reportable No