

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

Ex. A. No. 116 of 2018 Inre : O.A. No. 137 of 2017

Awadhesh Kumar Pandey
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>02.02.2021</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant Shri Namit Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Shri Namit Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submitted that although leave to appeal was dismissed on 27.01.2021, but the order being not uploaded on the website of the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Lucknow, copy of the same could not be obtained and could not be transmitted to the concerned department to make its compliance. Thus, he submitted that order be uploaded by today itself and its copy be given to the respondents by today itself so that compliance may be made at the earliest.</p> <p>Let order dated 27.01.2021 passed on leave to appeal be uploaded and a copy of same be given to Counsel for respondents today itself and thereafter compliance of order be made within four weeks and affidavit of compliance be filed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 05.03.2021.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 383 of 2019

Hav/Clk Gurjant 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>02.02.2021</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 Wg Cdr SN Dwivedi, learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Gyan Singh, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>1. Aggrieved by the respondents' order dated 16.04.2019, denying him premature discharge, applicant has filed the instant O.A. seeking following reliefs:</p> <p>(I) <i>To issue an order or direction setting aside the impugned order dated 16.04.2019 to the extent it says that at present it is not feasible to consider the request for premature discharge of the applicant.</i></p> <p>(II) <i>To issue an order or direction to the respondents deciding the issue of premature discharge of the applicant in a definite manner which he was already raised by way of application dated 29.03.2019 and the same has been forwarded by the competent authorities as well.</i></p> <p>(III) <i>To issue an order or direction to the respondent to permit the applicant to make a fresh representation submitting all the supportive documents and the representation so made by the applicant may be decided in a time bound manner.</i></p> <p>(IV) <i>To issue an order or direction to the respondent to broad-band the disability pension granted to the applicant.</i></p> <p>(V) <i>To issue an order or direction that this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper under the facts and</i></p>

circumstances of the case.

(VI) Award the cost of the application to the applicant.

2. Brief facts of the case are that applicant, while filing present application, was serving with ZRO, Lucknow (peace posting) and on receipt of posting to 19 RR (field posting) vide order dated 16.03.2019, he submitted an application dated 29.03.2019 for premature discharge on extreme compassionate grounds which was processed duly recommended vide letter dated 02.04.2019. Application for premature discharge was not acceded vide letter dated 16.04.2019 on the ground of deficiency of manpower and large number of such premature discharge applications being in queue. It was also submitted that premature discharge application is not supported with medical documents. Meanwhile, applicant submitted an application for cancellation/deferment of posting vide application dated 22.04.2019 which was accepted by the competent authority vide order dated 04.05.2019 and his posting to field area was deferred till 31.07.2019. The crux of the case is that he was denied premature discharge on the ground of deficiency of manpower and non availability of medical documents, which the applicant submitted alongwith his application dated 29.03.2019. It has also been alleged that some persons of the unit have been granted premature retirement on compassionate grounds. His further grievance is that his letter dated 29.03.2019 has not been given due cognizance and that reply of the letter is still awaited.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant is very much willing to serve the nation but on account of crucial domestic problems he has no option but to leave the army to look after his old

aged ailing parents. He further submitted that applicant's wife is also suffering from mental illness and due to prolonged separation (being served in non-family station) from family, relation between husband and wife stranded thereby causing a matrimonial dispute which was fortunately amicably resolved by intervention of relatives. His further contention is that applicant's premature discharge application dated 29.03.2019 has not been given due weightage and not decided as yet.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that on account of huge deficiency of manpower in the unit and also forthcoming raising of new unit, applicant was not considered for premature discharge on compassionate grounds but he was allowed extended tenure in the unit (peace area) he was posted to resolve his domestic issues. It was also contended that applicant's premature discharge application was not supported with medical documents. The learned counsel for the respondents further contended that since the applicant is in SHAPE-I, no broad-banding of disability pension is applicable to applicant as is pleaded in para 8 (iv) of O.A. He pleaded for dismissal of O.A.

5. We have perused the records and find that applicant, while serving with ZRO, Lucknow, had submitted an application dated 29.03.2019 for premature discharge on compassionate grounds which was not conceded due to deficiency of strength in unit/establishment. It was also advised vide communication dated 16.04.2019 to send supported medical documents. During pendency of premature discharge application, applicant's tenure at peace station was extended till

30.07.2019 to resolve his domestic problems before proceeding to field posting i.e. 19 RR.

6. It appears that premature discharge application dated 29.03.2019 submitted by applicant has not been given due credence and applicant has not been communicated any decision to this effect till date. Therefore, to impart justice to applicant, his application be termed as representation dated 29.03.2019 and needs to be decided.

7. While going through rejoinder affidavit, it is found that three batch-mates of applicant, even two being junior to him, have been granted premature discharge from service vide order dated 21.07.2020. It was also orally pleaded that some other persons have also been granted premature discharge after sanction of discharge in respect of aforementioned persons. The record also reveals that a fresh application dated 26.08.2020 for premature discharge in respect of applicant has been forwarded duly recommended.

8. Be that as it may, the respondents are directed to decide applicant's representation dated 29.03.2019 and 26.08.2020 within a period of three months and communicate the decision to applicant.

9. With the aforesaid observations, O.A. is disposed of.

10. No order as to costs.

11. Pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

rathore

