

	UKT/-
--	-------

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No.1

M.A. No. 928 of 2021 Inre O.A. No. 255 of 2020

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants

Applicants

Versus

Ex Rect Anuj Pratap Singh
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>01.12.2021</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Heard Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicants who was respondent in O.A.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicants (Respondents in O.A.) submitted that applicants (Respondents in O.A.) has filed this application seeking modification of order dated 02.07.2021 passed in O.A. No 255 of 2020 by which, while allowing the O.A. applicants (Respondents in O.A.) were directed to reinstate the respondent (applicant in O.A.) in service and it was also provided that if the order is not complied with within four months from the date of production of its certified copy, the respondent (applicant in O.A.) shall also be paid interest @ 8% per annum till the date of actual payment.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicants herein further submitted that when no back wages has been allowed to the respondent (applicant in O.A.) the question for payment of interest @ 8% per annum till date of actual payment does not arise as this could be possible only when back wages would have been allowed.</p> <p>We have gone through the order dated 02.07.2021 passed in O.A. No 255 of 2020 and we find that O.A. has been allowed directing the applicants (Respondents in O.A.) to reinstate the respondent (Applicant in O.A.) in service without back wages. Back wages being not allowed to respondent (Applicant in O.A.), the question of payment of interest @ 8% per annum does not arise and, therefore, order needs to be modified. However, it is also true that there was no hurdle in the way of the applicants (Respondents in O.A.) to reinstate respondent (Applicant in O.A.) in service within four months from the date of order, as directed, but as the same was not done in the garb of modification of the order, the order needs to be modified to the effect that if respondent (Applicant in O.A.) is not reinstated in service within two months from today then he shall be entitled to pay and allowances along with interest @ 8% per annum from the date the O.A. was allowed i.e. 02.07.2021 till the date of actual</p>

payment.

Accordingly, modification application is allowed and it is directed that if the order dated 02.07.2021 is not complied with within 2 months from today, the applicants (Respondents in O.A.) shall pay the pay and allowance to the respondent (Applicant in O.A.) along with interest @ 8% per annum till the date of actual payment

Modification application stands decided, accordingly.

Let copy of this order be provided to Officer In Charge, Legal Cell for compliance within 48 hours.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

UKT/-

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.1

Ex.A No. 202 of 2017 Inre T.A. No. 15 of 2014 &
Inre T.A. No. 1368 of 2010

Maj Kunwar Ambreshwar Singh
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal		
	<p><u>01.12.2021</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Rahul Kapoor, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Objection to affidavit of compliance filed by learned counsel for the applicant is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that though applicant is entitled pay and allowance to the post of substantive rank of Lt Col wef 01.07.1997 but he has been paid arrears of pay from January 2008 and not from 01.07.1997. However, he submitted that PPO issued by the respondents is in terms of order for back wages. This shows that so far as order of compliance is concerned, the same has been done but the order has not been complied with by the Bank concerned.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">He submitted that he will make concerned Bank a party in the petition. Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that reasonable time be given to him to implead Bank as party which is allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let steps to impleadment be taken within two weeks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 18.01.2022.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</td><td style="text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</td></tr></table> <p>UKT/-</p>	(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)
(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)		

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.1

Ex-A No. 137 of 2018 Inre 170 of 2011

Lekh Raj Singh

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>01.12.2021</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Heard Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that he received a whatsapp message today from Shri SP Shehrawat, learned counsel for respondent No 5 and 6 that an amount of Rs, 5,54,039/- has been granted to the applicant as arrears of interest and after deducting Rs, 54,146/- as TDS from the same, Rs. 4,99,893/- has been credited in applicant's bank account.</p> <p>It is further submitted that there was no direction to deduct TDS, therefore, act of Bank of deducting TDS from the arrears is bad.</p> <p>Considering that arrears have been credited in the applicant's account, order seems to have been complied with. Therefore, application deserves to be dismissing being infructuous.</p> <p>As regards deduction of TDS, applicant can claim the amount of TDS from the IT Department, if not payable.</p> <p>With the above observations, execution application stands disposed of with full and final satisfaction.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.1

Ex-A No. 101 of 2019 Inre O.A. No. 34 of 2016

Ex Nb Sub (DSC) Sabhajit Singh
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>01.12.2021</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Maj Tarun, Departmental Representative for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Maj Tarun, Departmental Representative on the instructions received, submitted that matter regarding implementation of the order under execution is presently pending in Min of Def, therefore, some more time be given to file affidavit of compliance. The order under execution was passed in the year 2017.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Considering that order of compliance was passed more than four years back and no justifiable reason has been given by the respondents for not implementing the order, we direct the respondents to make compliance of the order within four weeks, otherwise DDG, DSC, Army Headquarters shall remain present in the Court to explain why order is not complied with.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 12.01.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Copy of this order be provided to Departmental Representative for the respondents within 48 hours for necessary action.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.1

Ex. A. No 206 of 2017 Inre O.A. (A) No 314 of 2015

Shiv Ram Singh

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>01.12.2021</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As prayed by learned counsel for the respondents, list on 10.12.2021.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>