























**Form No. 4**  
**{See rule 11(1)}**  
**ORDER SHEET**  
**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW**  
**Court No.1 (E. Court)**  
**M.A. No. 395 of 2021 Inre : O.A. No. (Nil) of 2021**

**Smt. Mohini W/o Late Sep. Satyendra Kumar**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>23.07.2021</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defects have been removed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Angrej Nath Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri R.K.S. Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The matter pertains to grant of special family pension.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In view of averments made in affidavit filed in support of delay condonation application, delay is condoned.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Delay condonation application stands disposed off accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let Original Application be registered.</p> <p><b><u>O.A. No. 396 of 2021</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Angrej Nath Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri R.K.S. Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Angrej Nath Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that Original Application may be disposed off with direction to the respondents to decide the applicant's applications dated 09.10.2019 and 04.06.2021, which are pending with the respondents, to which Ld. Counsel for the respondents has no objection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">With the consent of Ld. Counsel for the parties, we hereby <b>dispose off</b> the Original Application finally with the direction to the respondents to decide the applicant's applications dated 09.10.2019 and 04.06.2021, contained as Annexure Nos. 1 and 2 of Original Application, by a speaking and reasoned order in accordance with law, if not already decided, within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of this order and communicate the decision to the applicant accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be provided to the learned Counsel for the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b> Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> 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)**

**M.A. No. 396 of 2021 Inre : O.A. No. (Nil) of 2021**

**Smt. Mohini W/o Late Sep. Satyendra Kumar**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>23.07.2021</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>Defects have been removed.</p> <p>Heard Shri Angrej Nath Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Amrita Chakraborty, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>The instant Original Application has been filed with delay of 01 year, 11 months and 07 days in regard to which application for condonation of delay supported with affidavit has been filed.</p> <p>In view of averments made in affidavit filed in support of application for condonation of delay, delay is liable to be condoned.</p> <p>Accordingly, delay is condoned.</p> <p>Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p>Let Original Application be registered.</p> <p><b><u>O.A. No. 395 of 2021</u></b></p> <p>Heard Shri Angrej Nath Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Amrita Chakraborty, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Shri Angrej Nath Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that Original Application may be disposed off with direction to the respondents to decide the applicant's applications dated 09.10.2019 and 04.06.2021, which are pending with the respondents, to which Ld. Counsel for the respondents has no objection.</p> <p>With the consent of Ld. Counsel for the parties, we hereby <b>dispose off</b> the Original Application finally with the direction to the respondents to decide the applicant's applications dated 09.10.2019 and 04.06.2021, contained as Annexure Nos. 1 and 3 of Original Application, by a speaking and reasoned order in accordance with law, if not already decided, within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of this order and communicate the decision to the applicant accordingly.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be provided to the learned Counsel for the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b>      <b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> 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 (E. Court)**

**O.A. No. 209 of 2020 with M.A. No. 104 of 2020**

**Col. Shyam Sunder Rai (Retd.)**  
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><b><u>23.07.2021</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri S.G. Singh and Shri Anand Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Original Application has been filed with delay of one year.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><b><u>O.A. No. 209 of 2020</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri S.G. Singh and Shri Anand Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Original Application is <b>allowed</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For order, see our Judgment passed on separate sheets.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Misc. Application, if any, pending for disposal, shall be treated to have been disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b> Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> Member (J)</p> <p style="text-align: left;">AKD/-</p>























































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

**Dy No 1277 of 2021 Inre M.A. No 250 of 2021 Inre O.A. No Nil of 2021**

**Hav Mukhram Singh**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>23.07.2021</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. Heard Shri Ved Prakash, learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel of both parties are connected through video conference as Shri Ved Prakash had expressed his inability for physical hearing due to being not vaccinated.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that defects have been removed, one of the previous counsel has given consent to him for filing of recall-cum-review application. He further submitted that he is the sole counsel for the applicant who had requested Mr. Virat Anand Singh, Advocate, who erroneously filed bail application instead of parole application. He further submitted that applicant has filed a post confirmation petition to the competent authority which has not yet been decided. An appeal against finding of conviction and sentence can only be filed after post confirmation petition is decided. He further submitted that respondents learned counsel misled the Tribunal relating to filing of writ petition that applicant conceded material facts while obtaining the order dated 12.05.2017. In writ petition filed in Hon'ble Rajasthan High Court, illegality committed in GCM proceedings and that provisions of POCSO Act are not attracted in the matter are challenged which has nothing to do with parole.</p>

4. Learned counsel for the respondents, in turn, submitted that recall-cum-review application is not maintainable for no affidavit being filed along with it. He further submitted that applicant is guilty of concealment as in writ petition he has claimed stay of effect and operation of the order of conviction and sentence passed by the GCM. He also submitted that interim bail/parole can be claimed and granted in appeal only and decision in post confirmation petition is not must for filing of appeal.

5. Shri Vinay Pandey, previous applicant's counsel has submitted 'No objection' in favour of Shri Ved Prakash, learned counsel who has filed recall-cum-review application. Thus, defect in this regard stands removed. However, as no affidavit mandatorily required under Sub Rule (5) of Rule 18 of The Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rule, 2008, has been filed, therefore, review application deserves to be dismissed for this reason alone.

6. Even otherwise, impugned order has been passed after hearing both parties which cannot be recalled on the ground of alleged illegality.

7. It is relevant to mention here that interim bail order dated 12.05.2021 in M.A. No 250 of 2021 Inre O.A. (Nil) of 2021 enlarging applicant on interim bail for 15 days was passed absolutely on humanitarian ground to enabling applicant to perform last rituals of his father who died during COVID Pandemic. It was passed under belief being passed in an appeal filed against the order of GCM under Section 15 (2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 and applicant was directed to surrender before the authorities of District Jail, Lucknow, immediately after expiry of 15 days which he has not done till date. Applicant's plea for issuing direction to enable him to surrender in Central Jail Alwar, Rajasthan in place of District Jail, Lucknow, is not acceptable as he cannot be permitted to what he claims as per his choice.

8. This plea of the applicant is also not acceptable that as he has filed a post confirmation petition to the competent authority, as provided under sub Section (2) of Section 164 of the Army Act, 1950, and said petition is still under consideration, therefore, he can seek parole under Section 15 (6) (d) of the



Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 without filing appeal. The order of parole can be claimed and granted in appeal only.

9. Impugned order has not been passed on reason of applicant being guilty of concealment of fact relating to filing of writ petition but for the reason that interim bail/ parole can be claimed and granted only in appeal filed against the order of conviction and sentence under Section 15 (6) of the Armed Forces Acts 2007, not otherwise.

10. In view of the aforesaid, we do not find any force in review application on merit also.

11. The recall cum review application is **dismissed** accordingly.

**(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)**  
Member (A)

**(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)**  
Member (J)

UKT/-