

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

O.A. No. 484 of 2022

Ex. Hav. Inder Pal 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>14.11.2022</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>Counter Affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record. Heard Mohd. Zafar Khan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents. Original Application is allowed. For order, see our Judgment passed on separate sheets. 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

O.A. No. 924 of 2022 with M.A. No. 1136 of 2022

Ex. Nk. Vijay Bahadur Chauhan
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>14.11.2022</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 Sudhir Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Major Sini Thomas, Departmental Representative of the respondents.</p> <p>There is a delay of 08 years, 06 months and 15 days in filing of Original Application.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that limitation is not applicable in pensionary matters. It is further submitted delay in filing of Original Application is not deliberate.</p> <p>Cause shown is sufficient. Accordingly, delay is condoned. Delay condonation application stands disposed off.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 924 of 2022</u></p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of service pension for the services rendered by the applicant in Defence Security Corps (DSC).</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 31.12.1973 and discharged from service on 31.12.1995 after completing 22 years of service for which he is being paid service pension from Army. Thereafter, applicant was re-enrolled in Defence Security Corps (DSC) on 29.12.1997 and discharged from DSC service on 31.10.2011 after completing service of 13 years, 10 months and 02 days of service in low medical category. It is further submitted that since applicant has rendered 13 years, 10 months and 02 days of service in DSC, the same may be rounded off to 14 years and after condoning the shortfall of one year in view of Regulation 44 of the Pension Regulations for the Army, 2008, (Part I), Government of India, Ministry of Defence letter dated 14.08.2001 and ADGPS letter dated 26.09.2003 and Judgment dated 20.01.2015 of the Hon'ble Apex</p>

Court in the case of ***Union of India Vs. Surender Singh Parmar*** in Civil Appeal No.9389 of 2014, applicant should be granted service pension for the services rendered in DSC treating his services to be 15 years.

Case needs adjudication.

Admit.

Issue notice to the respondents.

Major Sini Thomas, Departmental Representative has accepted notice on behalf of the respondents, service of notice is waived.

Respondents to file Counter Affidavit within four weeks. Thereafter, Rejoinder Affidavit, if any, may be filed within two weeks.

List the matter before Registrar on **02.01.2023** for exchange of pleadings.

List the matter before Tribunal on **02.03.2023**.

(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

O.A. No. 925 of 2022 with M.A. No. 1137 of 2022

Ex. Sub. Maha Ram
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>14.11.2022</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. Preeti Mala, 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>Heard Shri Virendra Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Preeti Mala , Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 1137 of 2022</u></p> <p>There is a delay of 25 years, 01 month and 17 days in filing of Original Application.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that delay in filing of Original Application is not deliberate. Further, limitation is not applicable in pensionary matters.</p> <p>Cause shown is sufficient. Accordingly, delay is condoned. Delay condonation application stands disposed off.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 925 of 2022</u></p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that applicant was discharged from service in low medical category for which he is in receipt of disability element of pension @30% from the date of discharge i.e. 31.03.1997. It is further submitted that in view of Government of India, Ministry of Defence letter No. 1(2)/92/D (Pen-C) dated 31.01.2001 disability element was supposed to rounded off to 50%, however, the same was not done in the case of applicant, hence, this Original Application.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that broad banding is permissible in case where individual is discharged from service being invalided out and not in the</p>

case of normal discharge. She further submits that even for providing the benefits of broad banding no further authorization is required, as per Para 7 of Circular No. 596 dated 09.02.2018 the pension disbursing authorities can grant the benefit of broad banding without any further authorization. She further submits that Pension Disbursing Authority is necessary party, therefore, direction be issued to the applicant to implead him in the Original Application.

In view of the above, applicant is directed to implead Pension Disbursing Authority as party in the Original Application, for which steps may be taken within two weeks.

List on **02.01.2023**.

(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

O.A. No. 926 of 2022 with M.A. No. 1138 of 2022

Smt. Phool Kumari
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>14.11.2022</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 Shyam Singh, 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 Virendra Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Shyam Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 1138 of 2022</u></p> <p>This is an application for condonation of delay of 35 years, 02 months and 16 days in filing of Original Application.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that delay in filing of Original Application is not deliberate. Further pensionary benefits cannot be denied on the ground of delay.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that long delay of more than 35 years in filing of Original Application has not been properly and satisfactorily explained.</p> <p>Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides we find that cause shown is sufficient. Accordingly, delay is condoned. Delay condonation application stands disposed off.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 926 of 2022</u></p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that applicant is the wife of No.2949141 Late Hav./Hony. Nb. Sub. Kishan Pal Singh, who was enrolled in the Indian Army on 28.02.1961 and discharged from service with effect from 01.03.1985 in the rank of Havildar. The husband of the applicant died on 23.04.1995 after which applicant is in receipt of family pension of the rank of Havildar while her husband was</p>

conferred the rank of Honorary Naib Subedar after his retirement vide letter dated 16.07.1986 and, in view of that, applicant is entitled to family pension of the rank of Honorary Naib Subedar with effect from 01.01.2006 in view of Government of India, Ministry of Defence, Department of Ex-servicemen Welfare, New Delhi letter No.1(8)/2008-D (Pen/Policy) dated 12.06.2009 and Circular No. 631 dated 05.03.2020 issued by the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Prayagraj.

Case needs adjudication.

Admit.

Issue Notice to the respondents.

Shri Shyam Singh, Advocate has accepted notice on behalf of the respondents, hence service of notice is waived.

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.

List the matter before Registrar on **02.01.2023** for exchange of pleadings.

List the matter before Tribunal on **02.03.2023..**

(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

O.A. No. 738 of 2021

Hav. (Amb. Asst.) Madhav Prasad
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>14.11.2022</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>Supplementary Counter Affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>None being present on behalf of the applicant to advance arguments, we have heard Shri Vishwesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the respondents only.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for setting aside the order of severe reprimand dated 25.05.2021 passed in summary trial.</p> <p>A preliminary objection has been raised by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents on the premise that Original Application filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 against the order of severe reprimand awarded in summary trial is not maintainable. For this he has referred Section 3(o) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 which deals with "service matters" in relation to the persons subject to the Army Act, 1950, the Navy Act, 1957 and the Air Force Act, 1950 which reads as under :-</p> <p><i>"3(o) "service matters", 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), mean all matters relating to the conditions of their service and shall include –</i></p> <p><i>(i) remuneration (including allowances), pension and other retirement benefits;</i></p>

(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,

but shall not include matters relating to –

(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 postings 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), 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).

(iii) leave of any kind;

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

On reading Section 3(o) (iii) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 it appears that summary disposal and trials where the punishment of dismissal is awarded have only been included in the definition of “service matters” not any other punishments. Admittedly, in the case in hand, applicant has been awarded the punishment of severe reprimand in summary trial, which in view of definition of “service matters” given in Section 3(o) of the Armed Forces tribunal Act, 2007 does not fall in the purview of “service matters. Therefore, Original Application filed against such order in the Tribunal is not maintainable and Original Application is liable 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. 653 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Mukesh Goswami & Others
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants

Applicants

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>14.11.2022</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;">Counter Affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Shiv Nath Goswami and Shri Dilip Kumar Goswami, learned counsel for the applicants and Shri J.N. Mishra, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Learned Counsel for the applicants submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicants being enrolled in the Indian Air Force and retired on 30.06.2022 are entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2022 as per decision of the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (W.P. No. 15732 of 2017, decided on 15.09.2017) and this Tribunal judgment in OA No. 272 of 2022, Ex Sgt. Chanda Basha Syed vs. Union of India & Others, decided on 27.05.2022.</p> <p>On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that the applicants had served for complete one year from the date of their last annual increment, but they had not been granted annual increment as on the date of their discharge i.e. 30.06.2022 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2022. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicants and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble</p>

Madra High Court in the case of ***P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others*** (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-

"5. The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on 30.06.2013 on attaining the age of superannuation. After the Sixth Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July as the date of increment for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, i.e., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its [Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M. Balasubramaniam](#), reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs."

In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicants had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2022, but the increment fell due on the next day of their retirement 01.07.2022, on which date they were not in service, they have to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

In view of the above, the Original Application is **allowed**. The impugned

order, if any, is set aside. The applicants shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2021 to 30.06.2022, as they have completed one full year of service, though their increment fell on 01.07.2022, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.Os. to all twelve applicants accordingly, subject to verification of facts. The respondents are further directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till the actual payment.

Let a copy of this order be provided to the learned Counsel for the parties.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

SB

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

O.A. No. 650 of 2022

Gp Capt Ramesh Chandra Prasad (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>14.11.2022</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 Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Gopal Dwivedi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being commissioned in the Indian Army on 01.05.1986 and retired on 30.06.2018 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2018 as per decision of the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (W.P. No. 15732 of 2017, decided on 15.09.2017).</p> <p>On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that the applicant had served for complete one year from the date of his last annual increment, but he had not been granted annual increment as on the date of his retirement i.e. 30.06.2018 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2018.</p> <p>The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble Madra High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary</p>

No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-

"5. The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on 30.06.2013 on attaining the age of superannuation. After the Sixth Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July as the date of increment for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, ie., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep.by its Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M.Balasubramaniam, reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs."

In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2018, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2018, on which date he was not in service, he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

In view of the above, the Original Application is allowed. The impugned order 29.06.2022 is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2017 to 30.06.2018, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2018, for the

purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. accordingly. The respondents are further directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till the actual payment

Let a copy of this order be provided to the learned Counsel for the parties.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

SB

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

O.A. No. 682 of 2022 with M.A. No. 855 of 2022

Ex. Cpl Arun 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>14.11.2022</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 Wg. Cdr S.N. Dwivedi (Retd), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajiv Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This application has been filed for the grant of reservist pension to the applicant with alternative prayer to special pension also to be made to him.</p> <p>It is submitted that applicant was enrolled in the Indian Air Force on 05.11.1962 for 9 years colour service and 6 years reserve service. He was allowed to serve 10 years and 305 days and thereafter, he was not transferred to reserve liability in view of the decision taken in the meeting of Commanders of the Air Force in the year 1972.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant's case is squarely covered by the decision dated 12.05.2022 of AFT (PB), New Delhi in the case of Corporal Kandaswamy T vs. Union of India & Ors and also in terms of Regulation 144 of Pension Regulations for the Air Force, 1961.</p> <p>In regard to delay, learned counsel for the applicant submits that limitation is not applicable in pensionary matters and pension cannot be denied on the ground of delay.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents has vehemently opposed the prayer on the premise that there is delay of 42 years, 04 months and 02 days (Total 15452 days) in filing the application regarding which no satisfactory explanation has been offered by the applicant. In the case of delay, applicant</p>

has to offer explanation on day to day basis which he has completely failed.

Upon hearing submissions of learned counsel of both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the view that pensionary benefits cannot be denied on the ground of delay therefore, delay in filing Original Application is condoned.

Case needs adjudication.

Admit.

Issue notice to the respondents.

Shri Rajiv Pandey, Advocate has accepted notice on behalf of all the respondents therefore, service of notice is waived.

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

List on **02.01.2023** before Registrar Court for exchange of pleadings and list before this Court on **02.03.2023**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

SB

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

O.A. No. 95 of 2017

Ganganjot Kaur 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>14.11.2022</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 K.K.Misra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents No. 1 to 4 and Shri Ram Kumar Verma, learned counsel for the respondent No. 5 are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondent No. 5 states that decree of divorce between the applicant and respondent No. 5 has been passed by the court, therefore, application should be dismissed being infructuous.</p> <p>Judgment regarding decree of divorce has not been brought on record by respondent no. 5, therefore, he is directed to bring the said judgment on record by way of affidavit within three weeks.</p> <p>List on 24.02.2023.</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
Court No.1 E-Court

O.A. No. 120 of 2020

Smt. Anita Singh W/o Late Ex. NK Indrajeet Singh & Others 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>14.11.2022</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 Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri D.K. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed, list on 23.01.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

