

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

M.A. No. 574 of 2021 Inre : O.A. No. (Nil) of 2021

Ex. Gnr. Ram Chander
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>24.09.2021</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>Objection against delay condonation application filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Vinay Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>The instant Original Application has been filed for grant of disability pension with delay of 51 years, 04 months and 23 days.</p> <p>Briefly stated, applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 29.01.1960 and was invalided out from service on 30.04.1967 in Low Medical Category under Rule 13 (3) Item III (iii) of the Army Rules, 1954. As per Original Application, at the time of invalidation from service, the Release Medical Board assessed his disability 'NEUROTIC DEPRESSIVES REACTION (314) NOT UNSOUND MIND' @ 20% for life and opined the disability to be neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service and not connected service. The applicant's claim for grant of disability pension was rejected vide letter dated 01.12.1967. The applicant was unaware of the fact that there is any mechanism to prefer an appeal against the rejection of disability pension. In the year 2020 the applicant processed his case which was replied by the respondents vide letter dated 12.10.2020. It is in this perspective that the applicant has preferred the present Original Application.</p> <p>Submission of Ld. Counsel for the applicant is that delay in filing Original Application is not deliberate. The applicant has represented many times but in the month of May, 2019 in the gathering of ex-servicemen at Zila Sainik Kalyan Evam Punarvas Karyalay, District Hardoi the applicant come to know about law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of <i>Dhaamveer Singh Versus Union of India and Others</i> and various orders of this Tribunal in which it has been held that personnel who join service in fit condition and suffer from some disease and released in Low Medical Category then he will be deemed to have been invalided out instead of release and he will be entitled for disability Pension. Thereafter, the applicant arranged the money and handed over the documents to his Counsel for preparation of Original Application. Thus, his submission is that delay is not deliberate, but for the reasons stated above.</p>

Ld. Counsel for the respondents has vehemently opposed the prayer and has submitted that long delay of more than 51 years has not been properly and satisfactorily explained.

During the course of arguments Ld. Counsel for the respondents also submitted that applicant was non pensioner, therefore, his medical documents including constituents thereof may be destroyed after expiry of retention period as per para 595 of Regulations for the Army 1987. Long Roll in respect of pensioners and non- pensioners are retained for a period of 50 years and 25 years respectively from the date of becoming non-effective. Further submission of learned counsel for the respondents is that since documents relating to applicant may be destroyed on expiry of mandatory retention period of 25 years being a non-pensioner, therefore, degree of disablement cannot be ascertained at this stage. He pleaded the Delay Condonation Application as well as Original Application to be dismissed being barred by time.

Having heard the submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we find that explanation offered by the applicant for delay in filing Original Application is not sufficient. It is settled in law that if time limit is given for filing of any application and the same is not filed within that time limit, delay should be explained on day to day basis which applicant has utterly failed to do in the present case.

Further, we are of the view that documents relating to ex army person may be destroyed after mandatory retention period in terms of para 595 of Regulations for the Army, 1987. We could have decided the case, had there been related medical documents pertaining to the applicant and applicant could have been benefitted, but we are unable to impart justice in the absence of requisite medical documents.

In view of the above, we are unable to decide the case in vacuum after a prolonged gap of more than 51 years from the date of invaliding out from service.

In the result, we find that delay is not condonable and Original Application is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, delay condonation application is **rejected**.

Original Application being devoid of merit as well as time barred is also **rejected**.

(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

Ex. A. No. 63 of 2021 Inre : O.A. No. 20 of 2016

Ex. Sgt. Balkrishna M.
In Person

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>24.09.2021</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. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard the applicant Ex. Sgt. Balkrishna M. in person and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>The applicant submits that respondent No. 5 has paid Rs.2,00,000/- only in compliance of the order dated 13.09.2017 passed by this Tribunal in O.A. No. 20 of 2016. His further submission is that the respondents have failed to comply with the order under execution in its letter and spirit. His further submits that this Tribunal vide its order dated 13.09.2017 had observed that <i>"Accordingly, the O.A. deserves to be allowed with compensatory cost"</i>. The applicant also submits that this Tribunal had also observed that the applicant was illegally denied extension the respondents must have swung into action and would have granted him full back wages because of wrongful termination on their part. Mere submitting that he was paid compensatory cost of Rs.2,00,000/- and nothing left to be complied reveals apathetic approach of the respondents in dealing with the grievance of their veteran soldiers.</p> <p>In reply, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that the respondents have complied with the order under execution. He pleaded for dismissal of Execution Application.</p> <p>We have perused the order dated 13.09.2017 passed by this Tribunal in O.A. No. 20 of 2016. Para Nos. 19 and 20 of the said order is reproduced as under :-</p> <p><i>"19. Since the Applicant was discharged in 1995 and the dispute relates to extension of service which is beyond the realm of law, we propose to compensate the Applicant by lump-sum payment of Rs.2 lakhs. The respondents should not have denied the extension of service in utter disregard of Instructions contained in letter dated 06.11.1995, more-so when only one red</i></p>

ink entry was existing in the year 1991 which could not have been taken into consideration. Accordingly, the O.A. deserves to be allowed with compensatory cost.

20. In the light of the above discussion, we are of the view that it would be appropriate if the Applicant is accordingly compensated and thus we quantify the cost at Rs.2 lacs for the wrongful denial of third extension to the Applicant. The cost shall be paid to the Applicant within three months from the date of presentation of a certified copy of this order."

It is admitted fact that respondent No. 5 has paid Rs.2,00,000/- to the applicant in compliance of above order.

In the order under execution the applicant was compensated and quantified the cost at Rs.2 lacs for wrongful denial of third extension to the applicant. Except that nothing was ordered.

In view of above, we are of the considered opinion that nothing remains for compliance of the order under execution.

In the result, Execution Application deserves to be dismissed being infructuous. Accordingly, Execution Application is **dismissed** being infructuous.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

AKD/-

