

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

O.A. No. 76 of 2020 with M.A. No. 892 of 2019

Ex. Dafedar Vijay Pal 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>22.07.2021</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Heard Shri R.N. Tripathi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.2. The Original Application has been filed with delay of 36 years, 11 months and 27 days.3. 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.4. 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.5. 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.6. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly. <p><u>O.A. No. 76 of 2020</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Heard Shri R.N. Tripathi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.2. The instant Original Application has been filed on behalf of the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, whereby the applicant has sought following reliefs:-<ol style="list-style-type: none">(a) <i>An order or direction quashing the order of the OP No. 2 enumerated in Annexure No. A-1 and directing the respondents to re-compute/round off the disability pension of the applicant from 20% to 50%.</i>(b) <i>To allow the OA with costs.</i>

(c) *Any other or further order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just, fit and proper in the circumstances of the case."*

3. Briefly stated facts of the case are that the applicant was enrolled in Armoured Corps of Indian Army on 06.05.1964 and was discharged from service on 02.05.1982 (AN) in low medical category at his own request on compassionate ground under Rule 13(3) Item III(iv) of the Army Rules, 1954. The Release Medical Board held at Military Hospital, Patiala on 29.12.1981 identified his disability "**TEAR MEDIAL MENISCUS LT KNEE JOINT**" and assessed it @ 40% for two years, attributable to military service. Accordingly, P.P.O. was issued by the Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension), Allahabad. Thereafter, Re-Survey Medical Board (RSMB) was held on 27.08.1984 wherein the disability has been assessed @40% permanent. Accordingly, P.P.O. was issued by the Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension), Allahabad. Again Re-Survey Medical Board was held on 20.08.1994 wherein the disability has been assessed @30% permanent. Thereafter, again Re-Survey Medical Board was held on 26.09.1996 wherein the disability has been assessed @20% for five years. After five years again Re-Survey Medical Board was carried out on 28.08.2001 and disability was assessed @ 20% for life. Accordingly, P.P.O. were issued by the Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension), Allahabad from time to time. Presently the applicant is in receipt of 20% disability pension for life and has moved this Original Application for grant of benefit of rounding off of disability pension from 20% to 50% for life.

4. Ld. Counsel for the applicant argued that since the applicant is already in receipt of 20% disability element for life, therefore, in view of the Hon'ble Apex Court judgment in the case of **Union of India and Ors vs Ram Avtar & ors** (Civil appeal No. 418 of 2012 decided on 10th December 2014), the applicant is also entitled to benefit of rounding off of disability element @ 50% for life.

5. On the other hand, though Ld. Counsel for the respondents conceded receipt of 20% disability pension by the applicant but contended that the applicant is not entitled to the benefit of rounding off of disability pension on the ground that the applicant's services were not cut short as he was not invalided out on account of his disability. In the instant case the applicant was discharged from service at his own request on compassionate ground, therefore, the Ld. Counsel claimed that he is not eligible for the benefit of rounding off.

6. The law on the point of rounding off of disability pension is no more RES INTEGRA in view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment in the case of **Union of India and Ors vs Ram Avtar & ors** (Civil appeal No 418 of 2012 decided on 10th December 2014) wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has nodded in disapproval of the policy of the Government of India in granting the benefit of rounding off of disability pension only to the personnel who have been

invalidated out of service and denying the same to the personnel who have retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of their tenure of engagement. The relevant portion of the decision is excerpted below:-

“4. By the present set of appeals, the appellant (s) raise the question, whether or not, an individual, who has retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of his tenure of engagement, if found to be suffering from some disability which is attributable to or aggravated by the military service, is entitled to be granted the benefit of rounding off of disability pension. The appellant(s) herein would contend that, on the basis of Circular No 1(2)/97/D (Pen-C) issued by the Ministry of Defence, Government of India, dated 31.01.2001, the aforesaid benefit is made available only to an Armed Forces Personnel who is invalidated out of service, and not to any other category of Armed Forces Personnel mentioned hereinabove.

5. We have heard Learned Counsel for the parties to the lis.

6. We do not see any error in the impugned judgment (s) and order(s) and therefore, all the appeals which pertain to the concept of rounding off of the disability pension are dismissed, with no order as to costs.

7. The dismissal of these matters will be taken note of by the High Courts as well as by the Tribunals in granting appropriate relief to the pensioners before them, if any, who are getting or are entitled to the disability pension.

8. This Court grants six weeks' time from today to the appellant(s) to comply with the orders and directions passed by us.”

7. In the instant case, there is no dispute that applicant is in receipt of 20% disability element for life as this fact has been accepted by the respondents. In view of the settled law on this matter, we are of the considered opinion that the applicant is entitled to the benefit of rounding off to 50% for life with effect from 01.01.2006, however, arrears shall be restricted from 01.01.2016 in terms of PCDA (P), Allahabad Circular No. 596 dated 09.02.2018.

8. In view of the above, the Original Application No. 76 of 20 is allowed. The applicant is held entitled to the benefit of rounding off of disability element from 20% for life to 50% for life with effect from 01.01.2016 in terms of PCDA (P), Allahabad Circular No. 596 dated 09.02.2018. The respondents are directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date applicant submits mandatory documents alongwith certified copy of this order. Defaults will invite interest @ 9% per annum from the due date till actual payment.

9. No order as to costs.

(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 356 of 2021 with M.A. No 359 of 2021

Ex Rect Vishnu Prashad Gautam
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>22.07.2021</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 Shiv Kant Pandey, Amit ZPandey and Ms. Nisha Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Namit Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Objection filed by the respondents against application for condonation of delay is taken on record.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed with delay of 30 years, 01 month and 13 days.</p> <p>Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that applicant was enrolled in the Army on 30.05.1988 and was discharged from service on 07.08.1989 without following due procedure. No Invaliding Medical Board (IMB) was held despite being discharged in low medical category. Further submission is that applicant has filed this application for the grant of ordinary service pension as well as disability pension. Hon'ble the Apex Court has held in number of cases that law of limitation is not applicable in pensionary matters. Further submission is that delay, if any, in filing of O.A. is not deliberate.</p> <p>Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents has vehemently opposed the above submissions on the ground that present O.A. being filed after more than 30 years of discharge without sufficient explanation deserves to be dismissed being time barred. He submitted that all documents relating to applicant's service record except Long Roll, have been destroyed as per rule after expiry of 25 years which the applicant has not challenged in the present case. He further submitted that it is being wrongly claimed by the applicant that no IMB was held in his matter. As a matter of fact, applicant was invalided out from service and copy of Medical Board Proceedings was also given to him. He further submitted that if no copy was given, as applicant claims, he should have demanded the same then and there. Thus, he submitted that</p>

explanation offered by the applicant being not sufficient application should be rejected.

Upon hearing submissions of learned counsel of both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the view that in pensionary matters bar of limitation is not applicable, as cause of action in such matters accrues every month. An application for condonation application of delay cannot be rejected on the reason that concerned documents have been destroyed as per rules.

We have gone through averments made in affidavit filed in support of application and find that cause shown is sufficient.

Accordingly, delay, if any, is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.

O.A. No. 356 of 2021

It is a fit case for adjudication.

Admit.

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.

List the matter before Registrar on **22.09.2021** for exchange of pleadings.

List the matter before Tribunal on **12.10 .2021**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

UKT/-

