

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

O.A. No. 1043 of 2022 with M.A. No. 1250 of 2022

Sgt. Santosh Kumar Dubey (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>13.12.2022</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. Kavita Mishra, 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 Shri Sarvesh Kumar Verma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Kavita Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension to the applicant.</p> <p>There is a delay of 01 year, 08 months and 10 days in filing of Original Application.</p> <p>Being a pensionary matter, delay is condoned. Delay condonation application stands disposed off.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 1043 of 2022</u></p> <p>Case needs adjudication.</p> <p>Admit.</p> <p>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>List on 06.02.2023.</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 No. 1 (Sl. No. 6)

Ex. A. No. 44 of 2021 Inre : O.A. No. 493 of 2019

Ex. Sep. Pradip Kumar 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>13.12.2022</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, Ld. Counsel for the applicant, Ms. Amrita Chakraborty, Ld. Counsel for the respondents and Lt. Col. J.A. Raj Kurusappah, DSC Records through Video Conferencing.</p> <p>Lt. Col. J.A. Raj Kurusappah submits that against judgment and order dated 23.03.2021 of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 493 of 2019 draft Appeal has been prepared and is to be filed soon in the Hon'ble Supreme Court. A letter dated 05.12.2022 has also been produced before us regarding Government Sanction for payment of Rs.10,000/- as cost.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that since draft Appeal has been prepared Appeal and is to be filed in the Hon'ble Supreme Court soon, hearing of the case be adjourned.</p> <p>On the other hand, Ld. Counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the order which is to be implemented is dated 23.03.2021, hearing cannot be adjourned on the reason that draft Appeal has been prepared.</p> <p>Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides and considering that the order which is to be implemented is dated 23.03.2021, we find that cause shown for seeking adjournment of hearing is not sufficient, therefore, the prayer is rejected.</p> <p>We are told that the order is to be implemented by DDG, DSC</p>

Directorate, Army Headquarters, New Delhi.

Registry is directed to issue notice to DDG, DSC Directorate, Army Headquarters, New Delhi to appear before this Tribunal on the next date fixed to explain the reasons why action be not taken against him for non-compliance of the order.

List on **03.02.2023**.

Let copy of this order be provided to the Ld. Counsel for the respondents/AFT Legal Cell for 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 No. 1 (Sl. No. 8)

Ex. A. No. 80 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 411 of 2021

Sub. Ginesh Kochukuttan Kurup
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>13.12.2022</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, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This application has been filed for implementation of order dated 06.12.2021 in Original Application No. 411 of 2021 by which respondents have been directed to consider the applicant's case afresh in DPC 2020 along with other personnel of same DPC and promote him to the rank of Subedar Major, if he comes in the merit list and is otherwise found fit for such promotion as per promotion policy.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that in compliance of the order the applicant's case was considered in DPC 2020 and being not found in the merit he was not promoted to the rank of Subedar Major. He further submitted that applicant is entitled to 2nd and 3rd look/chance as per rules, direction be issued to the respondents to consider his case in DPC 2021 and DPC 2022.</p> <p>On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that in execution proceedings only the order which is passed is to be implemented and as the order passed in the matter was to consider the applicant's case afresh in DPC 2020 and not to consider his case in DPC 2021 and DPC 2022, therefore, his case was considered in DPC 2020 only and applicant being not found in merit was not promoted to the rank of Subedar Major. Thus, he</p>

submits that so far as the order in question is concerned, the same has been complied with.

Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides, we are in full agreement with the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that in execution only the order which has been passed can be implemented and nothing beyond. If we look into the order passed in Original Application No. 411 of 2021 we find that respondents have been directed to consider applicant's case afresh in DPC 2020 along with other personnel of same DPC and promote him to the rank of Subedar Major, if he comes in the merit and if he otherwise found fit for promotion as per policy. No direction has been issued to consider the applicant's case in DPC 2021 and DPC 2022. Since the direction contained in the order has been complied with by considering applicant's case in DPC 2020, we find that the order has been complied with. If the applicant is entitled for consideration of his case in DPC 2021 and DPC 2022, he can make application in this regard to the concerned authority, but no direction of this nature can be issued in the instant proceedings.

In view of the above, we are of the view that Execution Application has rendered infructuous and is liable to be dismissed as such.

Accordingly, Execution 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 No. 1 (Sl. No. 26)

O.A. No. 907 of 2022

Ex. Nb. Sub. Manesh Shanker NS
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>13.12.2022</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 to the maintainability of Original Application filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri K.K. Misra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Kavita Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension.</p> <p>An objection regarding maintainability of Original Application has been raised by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents on the ground that since the applicant after being retired from service residing in Kerala and not in Uttar Pradesh, therefore, this Tribunal has no territorial jurisdiction to entertain the Original Application.</p> <p>On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the applicant states that it is clearly provided in Rule 6 (1) (ii) of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 that an application may be filed with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction the cause of action, wholly or in part, has arisen. He submits that applicant's claim for the grant of disability pension has been rejected by the Army Medical Corps (AMC) Records which is situated in Lucknow and in view of Rule 6 (1) (ii) of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 this Tribunal has territorial jurisdiction to entertain the Original Application.</p>

We have gone through the Rule 6 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 and we find that an application may be filed by the applicant with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction the applicant is posted for the time being, or was last posted or attached; or where the cause of action, wholly or in part, has arisen. However, if the applicant has ceased to be in service by reason of his retirement, dismissal, discharge, cashiering, release, removal, resignation or termination of service, he 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.

On reading the above, it is clear that if the applicant is ceased to be in service for any reason he has option either to file application where the cause of action, wholly or in part, has arisen or with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction he is ordinarily residing. This being the option of the applicant, it is for him to decide as to where he wishes to file Original Application and if he has filed the Original Application with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction the cause of action arisen, the Original Application cannot be called in question saying it has not been filed with the Registrar of the Bench within whose jurisdiction he is residing, after being discharged from service.

It is undisputed that in the case in hand the claim for the grant of disability pension of the applicant has been rejected by the Army Medical Corps Records, the Office of which is situated in Lucknow. Thus, cause of action has arisen within the territorial jurisdiction of this Tribunal and, therefore, this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain the Original Application. The objection raised by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents is not tenable, hence the same is rejected.

Case needs adjudication.

Admit.

Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file Counter Affidavit.

List on **06.02.2023**.

(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 No. 1 (Sl. No. 27)

O.A. No. 919 of 2022

JWO Umed Singh (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>13.12.2022</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 Raj Kumar Misra and Shri A.K. Chaudhary, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension.</p> <p>An objection has been raised by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents regarding maintainability of the Original Application.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that applicant is not the resident of Uttar Pradesh/Uttarakhand, but of a resident of Haryana, therefore, this Tribunal has no territorial jurisdiction to entertain the Original Application.</p> <p>In reply, Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that while in service applicant was lastly posted as Junior Warrant Officer, 505 Signal Unit, Air Force Station, Memaura, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh and, therefore, in view of Rule 6(1)(i) of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain the Original Application.</p> <p>Rule 6(1)(i) and (ii) reads that an application may be filed with the Registrar of the Bench where the applicant is posted for the time being, or was last posted or attached; or where the cause of action, wholly or in part, has arisen.</p>

Since while in service, the applicant was last posted in 505 Signal Unit, Air Force Station, Memaura, Lucknow Uttar Pradesh which is within the territorial jurisdiction of this Tribunal, this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain the Original Application. The objection raised by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents is not tenable, hence the same is rejected. The Original Application is held to be maintainable.

Case needs adjudication.

Admit.

Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file Counter Affidavit.

List on **06.02.2023**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

AKD/-

