



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

**M.A. No. 754 of 2019 with M.A. No. 489 of 2021 Inre : O.A. No. (Nil) of 2019**

**Sep. Navghare Sudhakar Vishvas**  
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>28.10.2021</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 Rohit Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Being aggrieved with order dated 18.02.2019 of respondent No.3 passed under Section 20 of Indian Army Act, 1950 read with Rule 17 of the Army Rules, 1954, by which applicant has been dismissed from service due to being convicted and sentenced with life imprisonment for an offence punishable under Section 302 of Indian Penal Code, applicant has filed this Original Application for issuing direction to the respondents to reinstate him in service after setting aside the order of dismissal.</p> <p>Facts relevant for deciding the controversy involved in Original Application are that applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 13.03.2008 and after successfully completing the training was posted at Maratha Light Infantry, Unit – II, Belgaum, Karnataka. In the year 2014 applicant was involved in a Criminal Case for an offence punishable under Section 302 of Indian Penal Code in which his arrest was made and later he was released on bail in the said case under the order dated 16.09.2014 of District Sessions Judge, Washim, Maharashtra. He was later convicted in the said case after trial and sentenced with life imprisonment against which he has filed a Criminal Appeal in Nagpur</p>

Bench of Hon'ble Bombay High Court wherein under order dated 24.06.2019 he has been enlarged on bail during pendency of Appeal. After being convicted in the aforesaid case applicant was dismissed from service by the respondent No. 3 by order dated 18.02.2019 passed under Section 20 of the Indian Army Act, 1950 read with Rule 17 of the Army Rules, 1954 with effect from 21.12.2018. Aggrieved by the same, the present Original Application has been filed.

There being a delay of one day in filing of Original Application an application for condonation of delay being Misc. Application No. 754 of 2019 has also been filed and it is prayed therein that delay be condoned.

One more Misc. Application being Misc. Application No. 489 of 2021 has been filed by the applicant seeking amendment in prayer clause of the Original Application to the effect that respondents be directed to decide the Statutory Complaint dated 01.02.2021 preferred by the applicant within a period of two months as applicant is facing great financial hardship after being dismissed from service.

Two legal objections have been raised by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents regarding maintainability of the Original Application. Their first objection is that applicant being not the resident of a place within the territorial jurisdiction of this Bench nor cause of action, wholly or partly, being arisen within the territory over which this Bench exercises jurisdiction, this Bench lacks territorial jurisdiction to entertain and decide the Original Application. The other legal objection respondents have taken is that an application under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 may be filed after availing all remedies available under the Indian Army Act, 1950, and the same being not done in the present case as applicant filed the Original Application without preferring Statutory Appeal as provided under Section 26 of the Indian Army Act, 1950, the same is not maintainable under Section 21(1) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007.

It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that Original Application being not maintainable due to lack of jurisdiction and for not availing remedies available under the Indian Army Act, 1950, this Bench can neither condone the delay in filing of Original Application nor permit amendments. He submitted that this could be permissible only when Bench has jurisdiction over the matter.

In reply, Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that Unit in which applicant was posted was located in District Shahjahanpur in Uttar Pradesh when impugned order was passed by the respondent No. 3 and, therefore, part of cause of action being arisen within the territory of Uttar Pradesh this Bench has territorial jurisdiction to entertain and hear the Original Application.

Regarding other legal objection, Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that after coming to know about legal bar in filing Original Application under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 without availing the remedy of Statutory Appeal as provided under Section 26 of the Indian Army Act, 1950, applicant has not only preferred a Statutory Complaint dated 01.02.2021, but he has also sought amendment in prayer clause of the Original Application in this regard, therefore, this objection is also not tenable.

Rule 6 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 deals with place of filing application and it reads as under :-

***“6. Place of filing application. – (1) An application shall ordinarily be filed by the applicant with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction –***

*(i) the applicant is posted for the time being, or was last posted or attached; or*

*(ii) where the cause of action, wholly or in part, has arisen:*

*Provided that with the leave of the Chairperson the application may be filed with the Registrar of the Principal Bench and subject to the orders under section 14 or section 15 of the Act, such application shall be heard and disposed of by the Bench which has jurisdiction over the matter.*

*(2) Notwithstanding, anything contained in sub-rule (1), a person who has ceased to be in service by reason of his retirement, dismissal discharge, cashiering, release, removal, resignation or termination of service may, at his option, file an application with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction such person is ordinarily residing at the time of filing of the application.”*

On reading above, it appears that an application under Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 may be filed with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction (i) the applicant is posted for the time being or was last posted or attached; or (ii) where the cause of action, wholly or in part, has arisen.

It also appears that despite the above, an application may be filed with the Registrar of Principal Bench and subject to the orders under Section 14 or Section 15 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, such application shall be heard and disposed of by the Bench which has jurisdiction over the matter with the leave of the Chairperson only.

It also appears that notwithstanding contained in sub-rule (1), if a person has been ceased to be in service by reason of his retirement, dismissal, discharge, cashiering, release, removal, resignation or termination of service may, at his option, file an application with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction he is ordinarily residing at the time of filing of the application.

In view of above rule position, if we examine the case of the applicant, we will find that applicant could have filed application with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction he was posted, when the impugned order was passed, or was last posted or attached or where the cause of action wholly or in part arisen and, as he has been dismissed from service, with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction he was ordinarily residing at the time of filing of the application.

It is nowhere stated in Rule 6 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 that application may be filed with the Registrar

of the Bench within whose jurisdiction the Unit of the applicant, which passed the order, was located when the order was passed. This makes it clear that Original Application filed in this Bench is not maintainable as applicant was never posted nor attached within territorial jurisdiction of this Bench, when impugned order was passed. Applicant was not residing within territorial jurisdiction of this Bench, after being dismissed from service, when he filed the application. Thus, it is held that this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction to entertain and hear the application which the applicant has filed for the redressal of his grievance.

As regards other objection, it is not in dispute that after the filing of this Original Application, applicant has preferred a Statutory Complaint dated 01.02.2021 and the said complaint is pending decision. Applicant is aggrieved with the order of dismissal passed against him wherefore he wants to challenge the order which may be possible when Statutory Complaint preferred by him is decided or six months has expired from the date Statutory Complaint was presented.

In the circumstances stated above, since this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction to entertain and hear the case, the Original Application is dismissed being not maintainable. However, considering that six months period has already expired from the date Statutory Complaint was preferred, applicant may file Original Application against the order of dismissal with the Registrar of concerned Bench, if he so wishes.

With the above, Original Application along with Misc. Applications (Misc. Application No. 754 of 2019 and Misc. Application No. 489 of 2021) stands **disposed off**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)  
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)  
Member (J)

















































































