

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

O.A. (A) No. 626 of 2022 with M.A. No. 765 of 2022

Sgt. Suraj S.
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>03.08.2022</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 Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. Her name be shown as Counsel for the respondents when the case is listed next.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 765 of 2022</u></p> <p>Heard Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This is an application filed under section 15(6) (e) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 seeking suspension of sentence dated 10.06.2022 passed by the District Court-Martial by which applicant has been ordered to be in detention for a period of four months besides other sentences for the offences under sections 40(b) & (c), 41(2), 42(e) and 65 of the Indian Air Force Act, 1950.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant has been held guilty for committing an act prejudicial to good order and Air Force discipline, disobeying a lawful command given by his superior officer, using insubordinate language to his superior officer, using threatening language to his superior officer and for neglecting to obey a general order. He submits that applicant was framed in offences and held guilty on account of ill will and prejudices without having any grain of truth. There is no consistency in prosecution witnesses. No fair trial was held in the matter as proper opportunity of hearing was not provided to the applicant. Applicant is seeking suspension of detention only as he has already been dismissed from service with all consequential effects.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents submits that looking to act and conduct of the applicant he does not deserve suspension of detention. A fair trial was held in his case and cogent and concrete evidence being found he was held guilty and sentenced. She submits that finding and sentence</p>

recorded by the District Court-Martial is yet to be confirmed. She further submits that at present applicant is receiving treatment in Military Hospital, Agra regarding his ailment and, as such, not in actual detention.

Upon hearing submissions of learned counsel of both sides and that applicant has nearly served half of the detention awarded to him, we think proper to enlarge him on bail during pendency of Original Application (Appeal).

Let applicant be enlarged on bail during pendency of Original Application (Appeal) on his filing a personal bond of Rs 50000/- and one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Registrar of this Tribunal.

Application stands disposed of accordingly.

(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

O.A. (A) No. 626 of 2022 with M.A. No. 765 of 2022

Sgt. Suraj S.
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>03.08.2022</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><u>O.A. (A) No. 626 of 2022</u></p> <p>Heard Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel appearing for the applicant and Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel appearing for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application (Appeal) has been filed under section 15 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act against the order dated 10.06.2022 of the District-Court Martial by which the applicant has been held guilty for the offences under sections 40(b) & (c), 41(2), 42(e) and 65 of the Indian Air Force Act, 1950 and sentenced to undergo detention for four months, to be dismissed from service and to be reduced to rank.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents submits that Original Application (Appeal) is not maintainable being premature on two counts. Firstly, the order impugned in Original Application (Appeal) is not final being not confirmed by the competent authority under section 152 of the Indian Air Force Act, 1950 which clearly reads that no finding or sentence of a General, District or Summary General Court Martial shall be valid except so far as it may be confirmed as provided by this Act and, secondly, Statutory appeal preferred under section 161 of the Indian Air Force Act, 1950 by the applicant against the impugned order has not been disposed yet. Applicant is not permitted to avail two remedies together. He can file Original Application (Appeal) against the impugned order only after the same is confirmed by the competent authority and also the statutory appeal decided.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is no bar in law in filing Original Application (Appeal) against the impugned order under section 15 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 more so when personal liberty of the applicant has been infringed by keeping him in detention. He submits that impugned order which was passed on 10.06.2022 has not been confirmed yet</p>

without any cogent reasons. If applicant is forced to file Original Application (Appeal) after the impugned order being confirmed by the competent authority the purpose of the filing of Original Application (Appeal) will turn futile in regard to detention as in that circumstance the period of detention will be almost over. It is not known as to when the order will be confirmed.

He submits that impugned order was passed on 10.06.2022 and applicant applied for its copy on 15.06.2022 and respondents took 38 days time in providing the copy whereas as per rules copy is to be provided within a reasonable time which in any case could not be 38 days.

Upon hearing submissions of learned counsel of both sides and considering that order appealed which is dated 10.06.2022 has not yet confirmed while applicant is in detention under the said order, we admit the Original Application (Appeal) for hearing.

Issue notice.

Miss Appoli Srivastava, the learned counsel has accepted notice on behalf of all respondents. Service of notice is waived.

Respondents may file reply to Original Application (Appeal) within four weeks.

Rejoinder affidavit may be filed within two weeks next thereafter.

List before the Registrar court on **03.11.2022** for exchange of pleadings.

(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

O.A. No. 603 of 2022 with M.A. No. 722 of 2022

Ex. Sub. Madho 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>03.08.2022</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: justify;">Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Rajesh Shukla, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. His name be shown as Counsel for the respondents when the case is listed next.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Heard Shri K.P. Datta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajesh Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">In view of order dated 10.01.2022 of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Miscellaneous Application No. 21/2022 in MA 665/2021 in Suo Motu Writ Petition (C) No.3/2020, there is no delay in filing of Original Application, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Admit.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">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.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">List the matter before Registrar on 20.09.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">List the matter before Tribunal on 03.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 149 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 126 of 2021

Ex. Hav. Sur Sari Charan Mishra
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>03.08.2022</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;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 5 are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 5 prays for and is granted four weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 13.10.2022.</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>AKD/-</p>

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

R.A. No. 59 of 2022 with M.A. No. 548 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 303 of 2019

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants

Review Applicants

Versus

Ex. Rect. Beeresh Kumar
By Legal Practitioner for Respondent

Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.08.2022</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><u>M.A. No. 548 of 2022</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Rajiv Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the review applicants – Union of India & Others.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of application, delay of 01 month and 29 days in filing of Review Application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands disposed off.</p> <p><u>R.A. No. 59 of 2022</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Rajiv Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the review applicants – Union of India & Others.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Review Applicant has filed this application under Rule 18 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 by which applicants – Union of India & Others have prayed for review and setting aside the judgement and order dated 03.12.2021 of this Tribunal passed in Original Application No. 303 of 2019 on the ground that this Tribunal has not considered the matter of fact that the respondent absented himself without leave from unit lines and that as per Government of India, Ministry of Defence, policy dated 28.02.1986 in which it is provided that if a recruit who is absent for more than 30 days during training will not be allowed to rejoin his training. The order reads as under:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“A conceptus of our observations made above is that the O.A. deserves to be allowed, hence, partly allowed. The impugned order passed by the respondents declaring him deserter is quashed. The respondents are directed to reinstate the applicant in service and allow him to join his duty and complete his training as per rules and intimate the date of joining. The applicant shall not be entitled for any back wages or other benefits for the period he was out of service. The respondents are further directed to comply with the order within one month from the date of production of a certified copy of this order.”</i></p>

It is a settled proposition of law that the scope of the review is limited and until it is shown that there is error apparent on the face of record in the judgment and order sought to be reviewed, the same cannot be reviewed.

For ready reference, Order 47, Rule 1 sub-rule (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 is reproduced below :-

"1. Application for review of judgment.- (1) any person considering himself aggrieved-

(a) by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred,

(b) by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed, or

(c) by a decision on a reference from a Court of Small Causes, and who, from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record , or for any other sufficient reason, desires to obtain a review of the decree passed or order made against him, may apply for a review of judgment to the Court which passed the decree or made the order."

In view of the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions, it is settled that the scope of review jurisdiction is very limited and re-hearing is not permissible. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Para 9 of its judgment in the case of ***Parsion Devi and others vs. Sumitri Devi and others***, reported in (1997) 8 Supreme Court Cases 715, has observed as under :-

"9. Under Order 47, Rule 1 CPC a judgment may be open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record. An error which is not self- evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record justifying the court to exercise its power of review under Order 47, Rule 1 CPC. In exercise of the jurisdiction under Order 47, Rule 1 CPC it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be "reheard and corrected". There is a clear distinction between an erroneous decision and an error apparent on the face of the record. While the first can be corrected by the higher forum, the latter only can be corrected by exercise of the review jurisdiction. A review petition has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be "an appeal in disguise."

We have gone through the judgment and order sought to be reviewed and no illegality or irregularity or error apparent on the face of record being found therein, we are of the view that there is no force in the grounds taken in the review application so that order may be reviewed.

In the result, Review Application is **rejected**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

AKD/-

