

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

O.A. No. 50 of 2022

Ex. WO Vijai Pratap Narain 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>10.10.2022</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>Heard Shri Shiv Kant Pandey, Shri Amit Pandey and Ms. Nisha Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed under section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for the following reliefs :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. <i>This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to set aside Impugned Order/Signal No. 2021/AFRO/RRP/483 dated 28.06.2021 issued by O I/C CP Wing (Wg Cdr S Rawat) Air Force Record Office Suborot Park New Delhi (Annexure A-26 to this OA).</i>ii. <i>This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to declare Para 21 and Para 39 of the Promotion Policy 2020 issued vide Letter No. AIR HQ/C40651/PA (CPC) dated 25.08.2020 issued by ACAS (PA & C) of Air HQ, being ultra vires of Article 14 of Constitution of India, and null and void and struck down the same being unconstitutional (Annexure A-27 to this OA).</i>iii. <i>This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to direct Respondents, not to enforce Para 21 and Para 39 of Promotion Policy 2020, issued vide Letter No. AIR HQ/C40651/PA (CPC) dated 25.08.2020 issued by ACAS (PA & C) of Air HQ, being ultra vires of Article 14 of Constitution of India, during pendency of present OA.</i>iv. <i>This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to direct Respondents to grant promotion to applicant to Rank of MWO wef 01.07.2021, with all consequential benefits, in terms of Order/Signal No. 2021/AFRO/RDA/157 dated 14.06.2021 (Annexure A-25 to this OA).</i>

- v. *This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to set aside the punishment Severe Reprimand awarded on 14.06.2021, awarded by AOC Advance HQ CAC Lucknow (Annexure A-26 to this OA).*
- vi. *This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to direct Respondent no. 1 and 2 to conduct inquiry against Respondents No. 11 and 12 for their illegal acts and take necessary action against them, in accordance with procedure established by law.*
- vii. *This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to award compensation 50 Lakhs in favour of applicant and against Respondent No. 11, 12 for their torturous and illegal acts, and direct Respondent No. 11, 12 and Respondent No. 1 and 2 to pay the same to applicant.*
- viii. *This Hon'ble Tribunal may grant any other and further relief to applicant as it deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.*
- ix. *This Hon'ble Tribunal may award the cost of petition to applicant.*

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that Original Application is bad for (1) misjoinder of the parties (respondents No. 11&12) and (2) for plural remedies.

Referring Rule 10 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008, learned counsel for the respondents submits that this rule clearly states that clubbing two and more cause of action in one application is not allowed. In regard to one cause of action only one application can be filed, however, any number of reliefs flowing from the same cause of action may be claimed in the application. He submits that applicant has claimed many reliefs in the instant Original Application which are not flowing from the same cause of action rather they are being flown from different causes of action wherefore Original Application is hit by Rule 10 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008.

Learned counsel further submits that applicant has claimed relief of promotion to the rank of MWO which is quite different from the relief claimed regarding punishment of severe reprimand. Similarly, relief of compensation claimed against respondents Nos. 11 & 12 have no connection with other reliefs as they are not flowing from same cause of action but from different cause of action. Thus, he submits that different reliefs have been claimed in the Original Application which are not consequential to one another rather they are based on different cause of action as a result of which Original Application is not maintainable being hit under Rule 10 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008.

He further submits that respondents No 11 &12 have been arrayed in the Original Application in their individual capacity and not in their official capacity, as for any act done in official capacity they are not personally liable but remaining respondents are liable and, in that case, their arraying in Original Application is bad in law and, therefore, their names should be deleted from the Original Application.

In reply, learned counsel for the applicant submits that cause of action does not constitute a single act but it is bundle of facts which can contain more than one acts. In the instant Original Application, undoubtedly, many reliefs have been claimed, but they are based on one cause of action that is illegal and malicious acts done to the applicant by the respondents Nos. 11 & 12 as a result of which not only promotion of MWO was withdrawn from the applicant citing punishment of severe reprimand awarded to him in disciplinary proceedings which were initiated on false reports of the respondent No. 12, but applicant was also put to unnecessary mental pain and agony. Thus, he submits that all reliefs are connected with each other and being flown from same cause of action that is illegal and malicious acts of the respondent No.12.

Reliefs claimed in Original Application are related to setting aside the punishment of severe reprimand awarded to the applicant in disciplinary proceedings, his promotion to the rank of MWO after discarding paras 21 and 39 of the Promotion Policy 2020 being ultra vires, awarding compensation to the applicant from the respondents Nos. 11 and 12 for the mental pain and agony suffered by him and directing respondents Nos. 1 and 2 to take disciplinary action against respondents Nos. 11 and 12. Setting aside the punishment of severe reprimand awarded to the applicant in disciplinary proceedings is the relief which, if allowed, the relief of promotion would resultantly be allowed because applicant's promotion to the rank of MWO has been withdrawn because of this punishment only. Thus, setting aside the punishment of severe reprimand is the main relief and the relief of promotion is the consequential relief and Promotion Policy 2020 being connected with promotion, all three reliefs may be clubbed together in one Original Application being based on one cause of action.

As regards awarding compensation to the applicant from respondents Nos. 11 and 12, this is an independent relief based on alleged illegal and malicious acts done to the applicant by the respondents Nos. 11 and 12. This relief has nothing to do with the punishment of severe reprimand rather it is based on separate cause of action, therefore, can't be clubbed with other reliefs and so is the position regarding relief of initiating disciplinary action against the respondents Nos.11 and 12. These two reliefs are based on separate cause of action, therefore, neither can be clubbed together nor with other reliefs. Separate Original Application is required for each of these.

Applicant's plea that cause of action is bundle of facts and root cause of applicant's miseries being based on illegal and malicious acts committed by the respondents Nos. 11 and 12, all reliefs can be clubbed together in one Original Application is not acceptable. In view of facts stated in Original Application, only three reliefs relating to setting aside the punishment order of severe reprimand and declaring paras 21 and 39 of Promotion Policy 2020 ultra vires and promoting applicant to the rank of MWO being based on one cause of action are allowed to be clubbed together in one application. Other reliefs namely awarding of compensation to the applicant and initiating disciplinary action against respondent Nos. 11 and 12 also against them are neither allowed to be clubbed together nor along with other reliefs as they are based on distinct cause of action.

Further, respondents Nos. 11 and 12 have been claimed in the Original Application in their individual capacity and not in their official capacity. For any act done in individual capacity respondents Nos. 11 and 12 can't be sued under section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007. Any act done in individual capacity gives rise to civil liability for which relief can be claimed in civil suit only, not in Original Application under section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007.

In view of above, Original Application is held to be bad in law for misjoinder of respondents Nos. 11 and 12 and causes of action relating to reliefs of initiating disciplinary action against respondents Nos. 11 and 12 and awarding compensation to the applicant. Applicant is, therefore, directed to delete respondents Nos. 11 and 12 from the array of the parties and also the reliefs relating to initiating of disciplinary action against respondents Nos. 11 and 12 and awarding compensation for which steps may be taken within two weeks.

List on **09.12.2022**.

(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
E-Court

O.A. No. 812 of 2022

Col. Bhawani Datt Joshi (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>10.10.2022</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 Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, 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>Heard Col. H.M. Maheshwari (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This application has been filed praying for issuing directions to the respondents to hold RSMB of the applicant to assess his present disablement.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that in 1987 applicant suffered severe injury in his right ankle while playing inter battalion football championship organised by Divisional Headquarters. He was admitted in Military Hospital, Rajauri for three days regarding the above injury and was discharged after the swelling subsided. Thereafter, time and again he suffered pain and swelling in the said ankle, got treatment done and continued doing duties. In 2015 he felt severe pain again in his right ankle for which he remained admitted in Base Hospital Delhi for four days. The CT scan was held which revealed old avulsion fracture-bone pieces in Rt ankle joint area. In December 2015 he approached All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, Ortho Department for second opinion and was advised surgery for loose body removal but Specialists in Army Base Hospital did not agree with this and superannuated him in SHAPE-1 in 2016 and finally in 2020 after his re-employment. On 10 February 2020, he submitted a Non-Statutory complaint on which he was advised to approach the PS Directorate and DGAFMS for Post Discharge Claim. Then he approached PS Directorate and DGAFMS for needful action but nothing was done.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents submits that applicant has been discharged in SHAPE-1 and in view of that, No RSMB is required in respect of injury sustained in 1987.</p>

Upon hearing submissions of learned counsel of both sides we are of the view that case should be admitted for hearing.

Admit.

Issue notice.

Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Advocate has accepted notice on behalf of the respondents, hence service of notice is waived.

Respondents may file counter affidavit within four weeks. Thereafter, applicant will have two weeks time to file rejoinder.

List on **29.11.2022** before the Registrar court for exchange of pleadings and on **20.12.2022** before the Tribunal.

(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
E-Court

O.A. No. 837 of 2022

Sub. (NT) J.C. Kaswa
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>10.10.2022</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 Virat Anand Singh, learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that in regard to committing theft of Govt. property applicant is facing trial under section 52(a) of the Indian Army Act, 1950. Applicant wanted to be defended by Lt. Col. Kailash Chand Samota of 424 Field Hospital which was not conceded by the respondents. Applicant has been allowed to be defended by Lt. Col. Guka Shankar of Base Hospital Lucknow who is not of legal background. Applicant under Rule 95(2) of the Army Rules, 1954 has right to be defended by an officer of his choice, not of the choice of the respondents, hence directions should be issued to the respondents to allow the applicant to be defended by Lt. Col. Kailash Chand Samota, the officer of his choice.</p> <p>Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submits that Rule 95 of the Army Rules, 1954 does not entitle accused to be defended by officer of his choice, it only speaks that in a trial the accused, if he so desires, shall be provided services of a suitable officer, as far as possible, in his defence. It is nowhere provided in this rule that accused shall be provided the services of the officer of his choice. In the instant case applicant wanted services of officer in his defence which has been conceded and he has been provided the services of Lt. Col. Guka Shankar who is suitable for his defence. Apart from this, applicant has hired the services of a private counsel to defend him in trial.</p> <p>Rule 95 of the Army Rules, 1954 talks about defending officer and friend of the accused in trial. Rule 95(2) of the Army Rules, 1954 reads that if in a trial held by general or district court - martial accused desires to be</p>

represented by a defending officer, the convening officer shall use his best endeavours that accused is so represented by a suitable officer. It is no where said in this Rule that accused can demand services of defending officer of his choice. It only says that in case he demands services of an officer to defend him in the trial then the convening officer shall make all possible endeavours to provide him the services of a suitable officer. Suitability of the defence officer is to be decided by the respondents, not by the accused as if this choice is left with accused, this will amount to providing officer of choice of the accused which is not intended. What is intended is that a suitable officer will be provided by the convening officer to defend the accused during trial.

If we examine the facts of the case in the above proposition in terms of Rule 95 of the Army Rules, 1954, we find that nothing wrong has been done by the respondents while providing services of Lt. Col. Guka Shankar of Base Hospital, Lucknow to the applicant to defend him in the trial. His suitability can not be questioned being not of legal background. Moreover, applicant has already engaged a private counsel in his defence. In view of this, we do not find any illegality in order in communication dated 22 September 2022 detailing Lt. Col. Guka Shankar of Base Hospital, Lucknow as defending officer of the applicant. Original Application filed by the applicant for providing services of defending officer of his choice has no force and deserves to be dismissed as such.

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
E-Court

O.A. No. 813 of 2022

Lt. Col. Mukesh Baboo (Through Gulnaz Hussain)
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>10.10.2022</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 Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Satendra Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant stood retired from the service of Indian Army on 30.06.2021 in the rank of Lt. Col. after having rendered more than thirty two years of service. On 18.05.2021, applicant was illegally taken into custody by the respondents and subjected to disciplinary proceedings on the charges of having deserted the army thrice. In the disciplinary proceedings applicant has been held guilty and sentenced to be dismissed from service. No other punishment, including imprisonment, has been provided. However, despite the same respondents are not releasing the applicant from military custody in the name of findings of the court-martial being not confirmed by the competent authority. He submits that after disciplinary proceedings being ended in dismissal from service and no punishment of imprisonment being awarded in the proceedings, respondents have no right to continue further detention of the applicant in the garb of confirmation of the findings of the court, more so when proceedings had been completed in June 2022. Respondents are virtually violating liberty of the applicant which is his fundamental right, therefore, directions be issued to them to release the applicant from the custody forthwith.</p>

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents submits that applicant is a habitual offender who has deserted the army several times without any justifiable reason. He was taken into military custody and subjected to disciplinary proceedings as he had not surrendered nor apprehended by the civil police despite apprehension roll being issued against him. In disciplinary proceedings he has been found guilty on charges of desertion and dismissed from service. The finding of conviction and punishment awarded by the court-martial to the applicant is subject to confirmation by the competent authority and unless the same are confirmed the findings can't attain finality. He submits that in case findings are not confirmed by the competent authority then, as per position of law, it will be deemed as if there were no such findings and court will reassemble to hear the case to pass suitable order for which applicant's presence will be required and that is the reason applicant has not been released from the custody as confirmation of findings is still awaited. Applicant has been kept in custody under order dated 22 June 2022 of the competent authority under Para 392 (m) (2) of the Regulations for the Army.

During course of hearing, it was admitted by the respondents' learned counsel that disciplinary proceedings against applicant had been concluded by the court on June 22, 2022 and since then confirmation proceedings are pending before the competent authority.

It is not disputed that applicant has been tried by the court-martial on charges of desertion and has been dismissed from service after being found guilty in the trial. He was in military custody during trial which concluded on 22 June 2022. Despite being not awarded punishment of imprisonment by the court-marital in disciplinary proceedings applicant has not been released from the custody on the ground that findings of conviction and sentence recorded by the court-martial are yet to be confirmed by the competent authority. Findings are pending confirmation since 22 June 2022. After disciplinary proceedings being concluded and applicant being dismissed from the service in the disciplinary proceedings and no other punishment including imprisonment being awarded to him, we are of the considered view that applicant can't be continued in custody any longer in the name of confirmation of the proceedings more so when they are pending since the day of conclusion of the trial as it is violative of the fundamental right of liberty of the applicant. Respondents contention that in the event of findings being not confirmed by the competent authority the court will

reassemble to pass suitable order can not confer unfettered power upon the respondents to continue custody of the applicant for any period as it is against the law. If findings recorded in court-martial are not confirmed, respondents can arrest the applicant again to face him the trial, but for that reason they can't be allowed to keep the custody of the applicant indefinitely. With this view of the matter, we find that respondents should be directed to release the applicant forthwith.

As regards retiral benefits, no direction can be issued in this application as dismissal order can be challenged after findings being confirmed only and not before.

Accordingly, Original Application is **partly allowed**. Respondents are directed to release the applicant from military custody forthwith on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of rupees fifty thousand.

No order as to costs.

(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
E-Court

Ex. A. No. 202 of 2017 Inre : T.A. No. 15 of 2014 & Inre : T.A. No. 1368 of 2010

Maj. Kunwar Ambreshwar 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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Vikrat Anand Singh and Shri Rahul Kapoor, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Ld. Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 are present.</p> <p>No one is present on behalf of respondent No. 4 despite notice being sufficiently served.</p> <p>The grievance is that despite PPO being issued to Pension Disbursing Authority i.e. respondent No. 4 has paid arrears from January, 2008 and not from 01.07.1997.</p> <p>Registry is directed to issue notice to the Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Defence Banking Branch (01132), Sadar Bazar, Cantt., Lucknow to appear in person before the Tribunal on the next date fixed to file reply.</p> <p>List on 28.11.2022.</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
E-Court

Ex. A. No. 2 of 2021 with M.A. No. 180 of 2021 Inre : O.A. (A) No. 98 of 2014

Lt. Col. Subhash Chandra Pandey
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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Kaushik Chatterjee, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>An affidavit of compliance has been filed by the respondents, which is taken on record.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that since the order has been complied with, Execution Application should be dismissed being infructuous.</p> <p>Contrarily, Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that order has not been complied with in its spirit. As per order dated 31.05.2019, respondents were directed to reinstate the applicant in service and to pay 50% of pay and allowances for the period he was out from service i.e. from the date of discharge till reinstatement. He further submits that the order was to be complied with within four months from the date of order which was not done, it was implemented after two years and nine months of the passing of the order. Applicant has been reinstated in service on 14.02.2022 and during the period from the date of discharge till the date of reinstatement applicant has been paid only 50% of the pay and allowances.</p> <p>We have gone through the order and we find that it was directed in the order to reinstate the applicant in service and to pay him pay and allowances @50% for the period he was out from service. It was also stated in the order to get it implemented within four months from the date of its passing. In case of default, interest was made payable @9% per annum. The order was not complied with within the given time. The applicant has been reinstated in service on 14.02.2022 and for the period from the date of discharge i.e. 15.03.2014 till the date of reinstatement i.e. 14.02.2022, applicant has been</p>

paid only 50% of the pay and allowances, whereas pay and allowances @50% is payable till the date of order only and, thereafter, applicant is entitled to full pay and allowances. Respondents are, therefore, directed to make compliance of the order in letter and spirit within four weeks from today without fail else the officer responsible for implementation of the order shall remain physically present in Tribunal on the next date fixed to explain the reasons why necessary action be not taken against him for non-compliance of the order.

List on **09.12.2022**.

Let copy of this order be provided to the Ld. Counsel for the respondents/AFT Legal Cell to ensure compliance.

(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
E-Court

Ex. A. No. 275 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 686 of 2021

Ex. HFO Man Bahadur 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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri R. Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Alok Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents assisted by Sqn. Ldr. Ashutosh Pandey, Departmental Representative for the respondents are present.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that respondents have filed a Special Leave Petition in the Hon’ble Apex Court against the judgment and order of this Tribunal dated 16.02.2022, four weeks time be granted to bring stay order.</p> <p>In the circumstances, respondents are directed to bring the stay order or make compliance of the order within four weeks from today.</p> <p>List on 30.11.2022.</p> <p>Let copy of this order be provided to the Ld. Counsel for the respondents/AFT Legal Cell for compliance.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 491 of 2022

Ex. HFL Gorakh Nath Gupta

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>10.10.2022</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 R. Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align:center">On the request of Ld. Counsel for the respondents, two weeks further time is granted to file Counter Affidavit as a last chance.</p> <p style="text-align:center">List on 29.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align:center">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 493 of 2022

Ex. Nb. Sub. Ram 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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Virat Anand Singh, Shri Sher Bahadur Yadav and Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>On the request of Ld. Counsel for the respondents, two weeks further time is granted to file Counter Affidavit as a last chance.</p> <p>List on 14.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 495 of 2022

Ex. MWO (HFL) Awadesh Kumar Pandey
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>10.10.2022</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 Virat Anand Singh and Shri Anugrah Narayan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Prerna Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">On the request of Ld. Counsel for the respondents, two weeks further time is granted to file Counter Affidavit as a last chance.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 29.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 494 of 2022

Ex. Nk. Laxman Saini By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant	Versus	Applicant
Union of India & Others By Legal Practitioner for Respondents		Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri V.P. Pandey and Shri D.K. Dixit, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr.S.N. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>On the request of Ld. Counsel for the respondents, two weeks further time is granted to file Counter Affidavit as a last chance.</p> <p>List on 14.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 387 of 2022

Nk. (TS) Ram Bachan Pandey (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>10.10.2022</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>Heard Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh and Shri Mahendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri G.S. Sikarwar, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Original Application is dismissed.</p> <p>For order, see our Judgment passed on separate sheets.</p> <p>Misc. Application, if any, pending for disposal, shall be treated to have been disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

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

M.A. No. 1035 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 789 of 2022

Hav. Suryawanshi Swapnil Santosh
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>10.10.2022</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. 1035 of 2022</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Virat Anand Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Early hearing in the matter is not possible as the Original Application is already fixed for hearing on 23.11.2022.</p> <p>Early hearing application is accordingly dismissed.</p> <p>List on the date fixed i.e. 23.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p>

AKD/-

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

M.A. No. 1849 of 2018 Inre O.A. No. (Nil) of 2018

Ex. Sep Raj Kumar		Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant		
Versus		
Union of India & Others		Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents		

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri A.K. Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents No. 1 to 4 and Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondent No. 5 are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondent No. 5 submits that counter affidavit in the case will be filed in the Registry by tomorrow.</p> <p>List on 14.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 220 of 2016

Radhey Shyam By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant	Versus	Applicant
Union of India & Others By Legal Practitioner for Respondents		Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal		
	<p><u>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>A supplementary affidavit has been filed today in the court by the respondents which is taken on record.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant prays for and is granted three weeks time to file reply.</p> <p>List on 16.11.2022.</p> <table style="width: 100%;"><tr><td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</td><td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</td></tr></table> <p>SB</p>	(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)
(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)		

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

O.A. No. 206 of 2018 with M.A. No. 780 of 2019

Sep R Vinoth 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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Maj. R.D Singh (Retd), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.K. Pandey and Shri Rahul Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Being a Maintenance Allowance case, list on 14.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 72 of 2019

Maj. Yashvardhan 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>10.10.2022</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>Heard Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents No. 1 to 5.</p> <p>This application has been filed praying for dismissal of Original Application.</p> <p>It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that applicant has filed Original Application against the order passed by respondent No. 3 by which deduction was ordered to be made from the salary of the applicant towards maintenance allowance to respondents No. 6 & 7.</p> <p>In the case, after exchange of pleadings, a compromise has arrived between the parties and decree of divorce has been passed. In the changed circumstances, since decree of divorce has been passed between the applicant and respondent No. 6, applicant does not wish to press the application, which may be dismissed as not pressed.</p> <p>It is further submitted that in compromise arrived at between the parties, issue of maintenance allowance has been finally resolved by awarding permanent alimony to respondent No. 6.</p> <p>Considering that compromise has arrived at between the applicant and respondent No. 6 and in view thereof, decree of divorce has been passed between them and issue of maintenance allowance has been resolved permanently, application is dismissed being not pressed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 240 of 2022

Ex. JWO Nand Lal Yadav
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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Sudhir Kumar Singh and Shri Abhishek Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed, ten days further time is granted to file counter affidavit as a last chance.</p> <p>List on 15.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 279 of 2022 with M.A. No.326 of 2022

Smt. Janki Devi Chhetri W/o Late Ex. Hav. Rohit Dhar Chhetri Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ved Prakash Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed, a week further time is granted to file counter affidavit as a last chance.</p> <p>List on 16.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 408 of 2022

Rect Rinku Sharma
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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Arvind Kumar Jauhari, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Counter affidavit has been filed by the respondents which is taken on record.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit has also been filed which is taken on record.</p> <p>List on 12.10.2022 for final hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 409 of 2022

Ex. Nk (MACP Hav) Dattatray Vasant
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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Mohd. Zafar Khan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Deepti Prasad Bajpai, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>No counter affidavit has been filed. It must be filed within two weeks failing which opportunity will be closed.</p> <p>List on 17.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 127 of 2017

Jham Prasad Yadav
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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Veer Raghav Chaubey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>List on 30.11.2022 for physical hearing.</p> <p>The original documents held with Legal Cell to be retained and will be placed before the court for perusal of the Bench on the next date fixed.</p> <p style="text-align:center">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 473 of 2017

Amit 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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashok Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Kaushik Chatterjee, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Being a Maintenance Allowance case, list on 14.11.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 197 of 2018

Akshayavar Nath Pandey
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>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri S.S. Rajawat and Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Supplementary counter affidavit has been filed by the respondents which is taken on record.</p> <p>The case needs physical hearing.</p> <p>List on 02.12.2022 for physical hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 626 of 2020

Hariom Singh S/o Late Ex. Sep Kedar Singh

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>10.10.2022</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 Veer Raghav Chaubey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned counsel for the applicant submits that supplementary affidavit will be filed in the Registry within two days.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 16.11.2022.</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>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 758 of 2020

Ex. Nk Roopendra 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>10.10.2022</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 Vinay Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajiv Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present. The case needs physical hearing. List on 02.12.2022 for physical hearing. </p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-end;"> <div data-bbox="367 1440 911 1505" style="text-align: center;"> (Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A) </div> <div data-bbox="961 1440 1469 1505" style="text-align: center;"> (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J) </div> </div> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 9 of 2021

Vipin Kumar By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant	Versus	Applicant
Union of India & Others By Legal Practitioner for Respondents		Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal		
	<p><u>10.10.2022</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 Dharmendra Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RKS Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The case needs physical hearing. List on 01.12.2022 for physical hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">On the date fixed, learned counsel for the respondents shall produce original documents pertaining to the case for perusal of the Bench.</p> <table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"><tr><td style="width: 50%;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</td><td style="width: 50%;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</td></tr></table> <p>SB</p>	(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)
(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)		

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

O.A. No. 554 of 2021

Ex. Sgt. Rajendra Prasad By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant	Versus	Applicant
Union of India & Others By Legal Practitioner for Respondents		Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>10.10.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Wg. Cdr. AK Singh (Retd), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Shyam Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed by learned counsel for the respondents, list on 13.10.2022 for hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p style="text-align: left; margin-left: 5px;">SB</p>