

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

Ex. A. No. 55 of 2021 Inre : Ex. A. No. 184 of 2018, Ex. A. No. 21 of 2020 &
Inre : O.A. No. 275 of 2014

Ex. (Tel)-I Darshan Kumar 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>11.01.2022</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>Objection against maintainability of Execution Application filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Yashpal singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Applicant has filed this Execution Application to issue appropriate direction to the respondents to give effect to the Judgment and Order dated 27.04.2018 in Original application No. 275 of 2014, Ex. (Tel)-I Darshan Kumar Sharma Versus Union of India & Others, in letter and spirit.</p> <p>This is the third application for the execution of the order. The second Execution Application was dismissed on 25.11.2020, being infructuous, based on statement of applicant's Ld. Counsel Shri Yashpal Singh, Advocate.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that during the pendency of second Execution Application a sum of Rs.12,61,419/- was directly credited in the applicant's account on 29.10.2020 without providing any calculation sheet and, believing the said payment bonafide and accurate and in terms of the order, submission was made by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that order was complied with, with the result the Execution application was dismissed being infructuous. He further submits that after the Execution Application being dismissed, respondents started recovery from the applicant in the name of over payment and then applicant himself prepared calculation sheet and then it transpired against due of Rs.20,17,966/- only Rs.12,61,419/- had been paid, therefore, order dated 27.04.2018 in Original Application No. 275 of 2014, Ex. (Tel)-I Darshan Kumar Sharma Versus Union of India & Others, was still uncomplished with in totality.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the applicant further submits that the principle of res-judicata is not applicable in Execution Application as in execution proceedings no fresh issue is decided rather order passed in ensured to be complied with.</p>

He further submits that principle of res-judicata does not apply even in an application based on changed circumstances.

Per contra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that based on own statement of applicant's Ld. Counsel the second Execution Application preferred by the applicant was dismissed being infructuous on 25.11.2020. He further submits that present application has been filed against the recovery proceedings started against applicant by the respondents, which being a fresh cause of action a fresh Original Application can be filed to challenge the said proceedings, a fresh execution application cannot be filed to challenge the said proceedings.

Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides we find that this Tribunal vide its order dated 27.04.2018 in Original Application No.275 of 2014 has allowed the claim of disability pension, which includes service element also, and has directed respondents to pay service element of disability pension to the applicant with benefit of rounding off with effect from the date service element was last stopped in 2014. We also find that second Execution Application No. 21 of 2020 was dismissed on 25.11.2020 in full and final satisfaction on the statement made by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that order stood complied with. It appears that after the dismissal of second Execution Application respondents have started making recovery from the pension of the applicant in the name of over payment made in regard to compliance of the order passed by this Tribunal. This shows that present Execution Application has not been filed in respect of fresh cause of action but to ensure the compliance of the order dated 27.04.2018. Therefore, present Execution Application cannot be said to be barred by the principle of res-judicata. The preliminary objection raised regarding maintainability of Execution Application, therefore, can not be accepted.

Respondents are directed to file detailed reply to the Execution Application within three weeks.

List on **04.03.2022**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

AKD/-

