

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

Ex. A. No. 138 of 2017 with M.A. No. 116 of 2021, M.A. No. 179 of 2019
Inre : T.A. No. 83 of 2012

Jyoti Prakash 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>17.02.2021</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 style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri B.N. Choubey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 116 of 2021</u></p> <p>Submission of Ld. Counsel for the applicant is that in compliance of order dated 21.01.2017 passed by this Tribunal the applicant has been reinstated notionally, the applicant was notionally promoted as SWA-5 on 10.01.1991 and notionally retired from the rank of SWA-5 w.e.f. 09.01.2002 i.e. after 15 years of service. Accordingly, revised P.P.O. has been issued by the respondents in May, 2019. The respondents have not issued Discharge Book as per Section 17(4) of Navy Act to the applicant. The respondents have issued a certificate showing only the name of applicant's wife and the rank for the applicant as SWA/APP instead of SWA5 vide letter dated 26.04.2018. The names of children have not been mentioned. His further submission is that without issuance of Discharge Book containing the complete details of the family, the applicant cannot avail the medical facilities since ECHS Card cannot be issued. Further, CSD Canteen Card also cannot be issued in absence of Discharge Book.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents has vehemently opposed the prayer saying that the respondents have complied with the order under execution and there is no mention in the order for issuance of Discharge Book.</p> <p>We have gone through the order 21.01.2017 passed by this Tribunal T.A. No. 83 of 2012, Jyoti Prakash Pandey Versus Union of India and Others, which is being reproduced as under :-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"In the above conspectus, the petition deserves to be allowed and is accordingly allowed. The impugned order dated 16.04.1991 being unsustainable is set aside with all consequential benefits. Since the petitioner has already attained the permissible age of service in the</i></p>

Navy, he would be notionally reinstated and retired as per service for the first rank. He will not be entitled for back wages. However, he will be entitled for all Pensionary benefits from the date of notional retirement. The arrears shall be paid within 4 months of receipt of this order failing which the petitioner will be entitled for interest @9% for the period of delayed payment.”

We have also gone through para 3 of the order dated 25.11.2020 which is reproduced as under:-

“We have perused order under execution and find that there is no mention it directing respondents to issue discharge book to the applicant. Even there is no mention in this regard in the Original Application including the relief claimed. In absence of any direction to respondents to issue discharge book to applicant in the order, no such direction can be given to respondents in the execution proceedings.”

Having heard the submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case we find that petitioner has been held entitled to all Pensionary benefits from the date of notional retirement, which includes issuance of Discharge Certificate also so the applicant may be issued ECHS Card for medical facilities as well as CSD Canteen Card.

In the result, application is allowed and the respondents are directed to issue Discharge Book containing complete family details to the applicant so that applicant may be issued ECHS Card as well CDS Canteen Card within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order

With the above direction, Execution Application stands **disposed off**.

(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 (E. Court)

O.A. No. 153 of 2020 with M.A. No. 149 of 2020

Ex Nk Gurpreet 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>17.02.2021</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 Ashok Singh and Shri Vikas Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs Anju Singh, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>List on 30.04.2021 for final hearing.</p> <p>In the meantime, rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant.</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>rathore</p>

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

O.A. No. 105 of 2019

Inam 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>17.02.2021</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 Shri Kuldeep K. Srivastav and Ms Hemlata, Advocate holding brief for Ms Ruby Singh, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri RC Shukla, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>1. The instant Original Application has been filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for the following reliefs:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) <i>an order or direction quashing the impugned order dated 27.05.2016 passed by the opposite party No.4 contained in Annexure No.1, to the claim petition, be issued.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) <i>an order or direction be issued directing the opposite parties to pay the disability pension or;</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(c) <i>Some other suitable order which may be deemed fit and proper in the circumstances of the case, including an order of awarding the cost of this application in favour of the applicant against the respondents hereto be issued.</i></p> <p>2. Brief facts of the case giving rise to this application are that the applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 07.12.1980 and after having completed more than 16 years of service, he was discharged from service in low medical category CEE (permt) on 30.04.1996. Prior to discharge from service the applicant was brought before Release Medical Board (RMB) held at Military Hospital, Dharangadhra on 19.02.1996 which assessed the</p>

applicant to be suffering from 'Sensori Neural Deafness 389, V-67' @ 30% for two years and opined it to be attributable to military service. However, disability pension claim preferred by the applicant was rejected vide order dated 31.03.1997 on the ground that the disability with which the applicant suffered is constitutional in nature and not connected with military service. First Appeal against rejection of disability pension claim was required to be preferred within six months but the applicant failed to do so. The applicant is in receipt of service pension. The applicant has filed this O.A. for grant of disability pension.

3. Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant was enrolled in the Army in medically and physically fit condition and there was no note in his service documents with regard to suffering from any disease prior to enrolment, therefore any disability suffered by the applicant after joining the service should be considered as attributable to or aggravated by military service in terms of para 423 (c) of Pension Regulations for the Army and the applicant should be entitled to disability pension. Ld. Counsel for the applicant further submitted that disability pension claim of the applicant has been rejected in a cavalier manner without assigning any meaningful reason. Further submission of Ld. Counsel for the applicant is that the applicant, on 07.02.1985 while posted at Arunachal Pradesh (High Altitude Area), was diagnosed to be suffering from aforesaid disability. This disease he feels is due to stress and strain related rigors of military service. He concluded by pleading for grant of disability pension to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents pleaded

that though the RMB has declared the applicant's disability as attributable to military service but the pension sanctioning authority have rejected the claim being disability as constitutional nature. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the competent authority has rightly rejected claim of the applicant. He pleaded for dismissal of O.A.

5. Heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record. We have also gone through the RMB and the rejection order of disability pension claim.

6. After having gone through the RMB, we find that in the RMB dated 19.02.1996 in Part II of the board proceedings it has been clearly mentioned that the disability of the applicant is 'due to noise of artillery fire', and has been rightly termed as attributable to military service. However, the opinion of RMB has been overruled by the competent authority on the ground of disability being constitutional in nature and not related to military service. In this context the issue of primacy of the opinion of a Medical Board is no more RES INTEGRA. The same has been upheld by the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Ex. Sapper Mohinder Singh vs Union of India & Ors**, Civil Appeal No 164 of 1993 decided on 14.01.1993. The operative portion of the aforesaid judgment is as under:-

"From the above narrated facts and the stand taken by the parties before us, the controversy that falls for determination by us is in a very narrow compass viz. whether the Chief Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension) has any jurisdiction to sit over the opinion of the experts (Medical Board) while dealing with the case of grant of disability pension, in regard to the percentage of the disability pension, or not. In the present case, it is nowhere stated that the Applicant was subjected to any higher medical Board before the Chief Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension) decided to decline the disability pension to the Applicant. We are

unable to see as to how the accounts branch dealing with the pension can sit over the judgment of the experts in the medical line without making any reference to a detailed or higher Medical Board which can be constituted under the relevant instructions and rules by the Director General of Army Medical Core.”

7. Thus in light of the law settled by Hon'ble Apex Court, we agree with findings of RMB which has conceded 'Sensori Neural Deafness 389, V-67' of the applicant as attributable to Military service @ 30% disability for two years and we set aside the order of PCDA (P) Allahabad dated 31.03.1997 on this matter.

8. As a result of foregoing discussion, the O.A. is **partly allowed**. The impugned order is set aside. The disability of the applicant is to be considered as attributable to military service @ 30% for two years. The applicant shall be granted disability element @ 30% rounded off to 50% for two years from the date of discharge in terms of the Hon'ble Apex Court judgment titled ***Union of India and Ors vs. Ram Avtar & Ors***, (Civil Appeal No 418 of 2012 dated 10th December 2014). The respondents are directed to hold applicant's Re-survey Medical Board (RSMB) for re-assessing his present medical condition within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum. Further entitlement of disability element of pension shall be subject to the outcome of the RSMB.

9. No order as to costs.

10. Pending applications, if any, are disposed off.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

rathore

