

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

O.A. No. 276 of 2022

LS GI (S) Abhishek Kumar (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><u>10.08.2022</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;">Heard Shri Manish Kumar Rai, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This application has been filed under section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act against order dated 23.02.2021 passed in summary trial under sections 60(d), 68 and 77(2) of the Navy Act, 1957 under which applicant has been held guilty and sentenced to reduction in rank and to suffer deprivation of badges of good conduct.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned counsel for the respondents has raised objection regarding maintainability of the application in Armed Forces Tribunal, which shall herein after be called "Tribunal". He submits that section 3(o) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, which shall herein after be called "Act", defines "service matters" in relation to the persons subject to the Army Act, 1950, the Navy Act, 1957 and the Air Force Act, 1950. The provisions of the Act applies to the persons who are subject to the above three Acts. They also apply to the retired personnel subject to the above Acts, including their dependents, heirs and successors, in so far as it relates to their service matters.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Service matters in relation to the personnel of the above three Acts have been defined under section 3(o) of the Act and it includes-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) remuneration (including allowances), person and other retirement benefits;(ii) tenure, including commission, appointment, enrolment, probation, confirmation, seniority, training, promotion, reversion, premature retirement, superannuation, termination of service and penal deductions;(iii) summary disposal and trials where the punishment of dismissal is awarded;(iv) any other matter, whatsoever, <p style="text-align: center;">but shall not include matters relating to –</p>

- (i) orders issued under section 18 of the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), sub-section (1) of section 15 of the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957) and section 18 of the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950); and
- (ii) transfers and posting including the change of place or unit on posting whether individually or as a part of unit, formation or ship in relation to the persons subject to the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957) and the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950).

(iii) leave of any kind;

(iv) Summary Court Martial except where the punishment is of dismissal or imprisonment for more than three months;

Clause (iii) of the section clarifies that only the punishment of dismissal from service in summary disposal or trials falls in purview of “service matters”, not all punishments. In reference to this, he submits that no punishments other than dismissal from service in summary disposal or trials can be challenged under section 14 of the Act as they are not service matters in view of section 3(o) read with clause (iii) of the Act.

Learned counsel further submits that since the punishments challenged in the present application are reduction in rank and deprivation of badges of good conduct which are less than dismissal and have been awarded in summary trial, they do not fall in definition of ‘service matters’ and hence not cognizable by the Armed Forces Tribunal under section 14 of the Act. Instant Original Application therefore deserves to be dismissed being not maintainable.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the applicant submits that clause (iii) of section 3(o) can not be read in isolation, it needs to be read along with clause (ii) which clearly says that punishment of reversion is a service matter. Reversion and reduction in rank both are one and the same thing and since reversion is incorporated in clause (ii) of section 3(o), it is cognizable by the Tribunal under section 14 of the Act. He submits that reversion is a harsh punishment which seriously affects the service career of persons subject to armed forces, it can not be denied being tried by the Tribunal being not service matter under section 3(o) read with clause (iii) of the Act, more so when it is explicitly mentioned in clause(ii). Tribunal has been created with object to provide platform to the personnel of the armed forces for redressal of their grievances hence, it can’t deny trying a case saying order challenged is not a service matter howsoever badly it affects the service career.

This question has been coming across time and again whether Tribunal has jurisdiction to decide all disputes relating to service matters of armed forces being used, or only those defined as “service matters” in section 3(o) of the Act. Allahabad High Court came across this issue in the case of *Major Kunwar Ambreshwar Prasad Singh Vs Union of India Through Ministry of Defence New Delhi*, in Service Bench No. 8051 of 1989, decided on

20.02.2014. In this case petitioner of the case had filed petition against the order of severe reprimand awarded in summary trial which after coming into effect of Tribunal was transferred to Tribunal under section 36 of the Act being service matter. The Principal Bench of the Tribunal however returned the same to the High Court on the premise that question of punishment with regard to service reprimand may not be adjudicated by the Tribunal in view of definition of service matter given in section 3(o) of the Act. The issue was taken up by a Division Bench of the High Court which held that view taken by the Principal Bench was not correct as issue is covered in service matter in any other matter in clause (iv) of section 3(o) of the Act. Following this view of the High Court many other Benches of the Tribunal held that issue is covered under service matter and decided accordingly.

The Principal Bench took up this issue again in the case of *Dfr Shatrughan Singh Tomar Vs Union of India & Ors* in O.A. No. 665 of 2020, decided on 7th April 2021 and held that view taken by the Allahabad High Court is incorrect. It held that jurisdiction can neither be conferred nor created but is derived from the respective statute. It can not be interpreted nor enlarged but has to be construed within the legislative intent so mentioned in the Act. It further held that while defining "service matters" in relation to persons subject to the Army Act, the Navy Act and the Air Force Act the Parliament in its wisdom has excluded certain punishments provided in summary disposal or trials or summary court-martial from the purview of "service matters" which can not be treated in any other matters in clause (iv) being service matter.

Having a glance on the above, we are conscious that different kinds of punishments have been mentioned in the Army Act, the Navy Act and the Air Force Act which can be inflicted to personnel of the armed forces for the acts and omissions done in their respective Act and also for the civil offences committed by them. We are also aware that none of the above three Acts talk about the punishment reversion, they only talk about reduction in rank besides other punishments. Reversion has been mentioned in clause (ii) of section 3(o) of the Act in definition of "service matters". However, clause (iii) clarifies that in relation to summary disposal or trials service matter is one where the punishment of dismissal is awarded. A conjoint reading of clause (ii) and (iii) gives the impression that both reversion and reduction in rank may be one and the same thing with regard to punishments provided in above three Acts. However, when a punishment is awarded through the process of summary disposal or trial only the punishment of dismissal will be treated as a service matter, not any other punishment because clause (ii) can not be read in isolation, as it will have to be read together with clause (iii) and also proviso 3(o) (iv) of clause (iv), if the punishment has been awarded in summary court-martial, as the case may be.

In view of the above, we are of the considered view that since punishment of reduction in rank and deprivation of badges of good conduct

challenged in the present Original Application have been awarded in summary trial, therefore, they are not service matters in view of section 3(o) (ii) read with clause (iii) of the Act. As such, Tribunal has no jurisdiction to try the Original Application.

In the result, Original Application is dismissed being not maintainable.

(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. 628 of 2022

Hav. Gurpreet 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>10.08.2022</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 Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Vinay Pandey, Ld. Counsel appearing for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel appearing for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for issuing direction to the respondent No. 2 to take cognizance of representation dated 14.12.2021, which is Annexure No. A-1 to the Original Application, and dismiss respondent No. 6 from service after holding investigation in the matter in the light of evidence provided by the applicant being a case of fraudulent enrolment.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that respondent No. 6 has secured enrolment in the Army by suppressing material facts regarding the criminal case under Sections 326, 325, 323, 506, 148, 149, 354, 336, 447, 382, 452 IPC pending against him in the Court of Shri Tanvir Singh, J.M.I.C., Taran Taran, Punjab. He submits that the above criminal case was pending against the respondent No. 6 when he was enrolled in the Army. He knowingly suppressed this fact and got his enrolment. Had he disclosed about the criminal case pending against him at the time of enrolment, he would never be enrolled.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the applicant further submits that applicant has preferred a representation dated 14.12.2021 to the respondent No. 2 apprising him about the criminal case against respondent No. 6 and has requested him to dismiss the applicant from the service of Army being a case of fraudulent enrolment, however, no action has been taken on it yet.</p> <p>On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that Original Application should be dismissed being not maintainable. He submits that Original Application under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 can be filed in respect of "service matter" defined under Section 3 (o) of the Act and not on any other reasons. Applicant, who himself is Havildar in the</p>

Army, has preferred a representation to respondent No. 2 to take administrative action against respondent No. 6 claiming that enrolment of the latter in the Army is fraudulent. The subject matter in respect of which he has filed the Original Application does not fall in the definition of 'service matter'. Applicant has sought an order in the nature of mandamus to the respondent No. 2 to dismiss respondent No. 6 from service by way of this Original Application which can be granted by the High Court, not by this Tribunal. This Original Application being not filed in respect of 'service matters', but in the nature of mandamus which is beyond the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, the same is liable to be dismissed being not maintainable.

Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides we find that this Original Application has not been filed in respect of any 'service matters' defined under Section 3(o) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007. Applicant's grievance is that he has preferred a representation to respondent No. 2 in regard to fraudulent enrolment of the respondent No. 6. He has stated that respondent No. 2 has not taken any cognizance on his representation. Therefore, he is seeking direction in the nature of mandamus to take administrative action against respondent No. 6 which is beyond the purview of this Tribunal. Tribunal has jurisdiction in respect of 'service matters' only in relation to persons who are subject to Army Act, 1950, the Navy Act, 1957 and the Air Force Act, 1950. This case being not related with 'service matters', but in regard to a complaint, the same is not cognizable under the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007.

In the result, Original Application deserves to be dismissed being not maintainable.

Accordingly, Original Application is **dismissed**.

(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
By Circulation
R.A. No. 67 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 216 of 2022

Nb. Sub. (Nur. Tech.) Ritesh Kumar
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>10.08.2022</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>R.A. No. 67 of 2022</u></p> <p>The file has been placed before us by Circulation.</p> <p>The applicant has filed this application under Rule 18 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 by which applicant has prayed for review and setting aside the judgement and order dated 07.07.2022 of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 216 of 2022, by means of which Original Application has been dismissed, <i>inter alia</i> on the ground that the applicant has not been heard properly in accordance with natural justice, this Tribunal has not considered the order passed by the AFT, Principal New Delhi in the O.A. NO. 2670 of 2021, Cpl. Ayush Maurya Vs. UOI & Others, and O.A. No. 2716 of 2021, Sgt. Kuldeep Kumar Bibhuti Vs. UOI & Others and this Tribunal has not considered that similarly situated colleagues of the applicant have been granted premature retirement.</p> <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.</p> <p>For ready reference, Order 47, Rule 1 sub-rule (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 is reproduced below :-</p> <p><i>"1. Application for review of judgment.- (1) any person considering himself aggrieved-</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(a) by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred,</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(b) by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed, or</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(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."</i></p>

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**.

Misc. Application, if any, pending for disposal, shall be treated to have been disposed of.

(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. 90 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 393 of 2020

Ex. MACP Hav. Tejpal Singh Chand
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>10.08.2022</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;">Heard Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents assisted by Shri Rajeev Tiwari, Accounts Officer, PCDA (P), Prayagraj.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that PPO has been generated.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Affidavit of compliance annexing therewith copy of PPO be filed within two months.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 19.09.2022.</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>

