

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No.1

O.A. No. 801 of 2021 with M.A. No. 948 of 2021

Hony. Nb. Sub. Vinod Kumar
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>09.12.2021</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>Memo of Appearance filed by Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri V.P. Pandey and Shri Rajesh Kumar Pundir, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>The Original Application has been filed with delay of 23 years, 09 months and 13 days.</p> <p>Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that it is a pensionary matter in which bar of limitation is not applicable. His further submission is that delay in filing Original Application is not deliberate, but for the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of application.</p> <p>Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submits that explanation of delay offered by the applicant is not sufficient as he has failed to offer day to day explanation of delay.</p> <p>Considering that in pensionary matters bar of limitation is not applicable and grounds stated in affidavit filed in support of delay condonation application are genuine and sufficient, delay is liable to be condoned.</p> <p>Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 801 of 2021</u></p> <p>It is a fit case for adjudication. Admit.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents seeks and is allowed four weeks time to file Counter Affidavit. Rejoinder Affidavit, if any, may be filed within two weeks thereafter.</p> <p>List the matter before Registrar on 20.01.2022 for exchange of pleadings. List the matter before Tribunal on 21.03..2022.</p> <p>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 803 of 2021

Hav. Ram Yash Pal
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>09.12.2021</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>Memo of Appearance filed by Ms. Prerna Singh, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Vikas Singh Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Prerna Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Applicant has filed this Original Application against the order by which he has been summarily tried under Section 80 of the Army Act and punished with severe reprimand.</p> <p>The submission of Ld. Counsel for the respondents is that by means of instant Original Application the applicant has challenged the order of severe reprimand (punishment) awarded in Summary Trial. His further submission is that the order of severe reprimand passed in Summary Trial being not covered in "service matters" in Section 3(o) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, the same is not cognizable by Armed Forces Tribunal. For this, he has placed reliance on the Judgment of Armed Forces Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi in Original Application No. 665 of 2020, <i>Dfr. Shatrughan Singh Tomar Vs. Union of India and Others</i>, decided on 07.04.2021.</p> <p>In reply, the submission of Ld. Counsel for the applicant is that order of severe reprimand is cognizable by the Armed Forces Tribunal.</p> <p>We have gone through the order passed in Summary Trial by which applicant has been punished with severe reprimand as well as the order of Armed Forces Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi in Original Application No. 665 of 2020, decided on 07.04.2021. We have also gone through the definition of "service matter" as laid down in Section 3(o) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 and we find that punishment of severe reprimand awarded in Summary Trial is excluded from the ambit of "service matters" and relying upon the same Armed Forces Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi has held that such order is not cognizable by the Armed Forces Tribunal.</p>

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the view that order of severe reprimand awarded in Summary Trial being not covered under definition of "service matter" as given in Section 3(o) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, the same is not cognizable by Armed Forces Tribunal as held by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi. Therefore, the present Original Application being filed against the order of severe reprimand awarded in Summary Trial being not cognizable by the Armed Forces Tribunal is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, Original Application is dismissed being not cognizable by Armed Forces Tribunal.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

AKD/-

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

O.A. No. 807 of 2021 with M.A. No. 953 of 2021

Ex. Sigm. Gajendra 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>09.12.2021</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>Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Amit Jaiswal, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri V.K. Chahar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>The Original Application has been filed with delay of 06 years, 02 months and 01 day.</p> <p>Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that it is a pensionary matter in which bar of limitation is not applicable. His further submission is that delay in filing Original Application is not deliberate, but for the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of application.</p> <p>Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submits that explanation of delay offered by the applicant is not sufficient as he has failed to offer day to day explanation of delay.</p> <p>Considering that in pensionary matters bar of limitation is not applicable and grounds stated in affidavit filed in support of delay condonation application are genuine and sufficient, delay is liable to be condoned.</p> <p>Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 807 of 2021</u></p> <p>It is a fit case for adjudication.</p> <p>Admit.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents seeks and is allowed four weeks time to file Counter Affidavit. Rejoinder Affidavit, if any, may be filed within two weeks thereafter.</p> <p>List on 23.03.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 127 of 2021

Ex Sub Hari 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>09.12.2021</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Parijaat Belaura, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RKS Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the respondent No. 1 to 4 are present.</p> <p>Col R.K. Mahajan, Commanding Officer 28 RR (JAK RIF) has been impleaded as respondent No. 5 in the O.A. in his personal capacity to whom notice was issued and served but he has not turned up. The case shall proceed ex parte against him.</p> <p>Heard arguments of learned counsel of the parties.</p> <p>Judgment is reserved.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

