

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

**Ex. A. No. 18 of 2018 Inre : T.A. No. 133 of 2010**

**Yogendra Singh Tomar**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>Heard Shri D.K.S. Rathore, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Major Tarun V. Pillai, Departmental Representative for the respondents.</p> <p>An affidavit of Capt. V.S. Rathore annexing therewith copy of letter dated 16.03.2022 of OIC Records has been filed today in Court which is taken on record.</p> <p>In affidavit it has been stated that in regard to implementation of the order the Sheet-Roll along with dossier and connected documents of the applicant was forwarded to PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles for carrying out of his FSA, however, PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles has returned the same for want of pension papers. Thereafter, the Office of OIC Records has forwarded blank set of pension papers to the applicant for completing them in all respects and submit the same through Zila Sainik Board. It has been further stated that on March 15, 2022, the Office of OIC Records had contacted the applicant telephonically and the applicant had intimated that pension documents were sent by Speed Post. It has been further stated that pension documents have not been received by the Office of OIC Records till date, with the result the case of the applicant is held up for want of pension documents. It has been further stated that LPC-cum-Data Sheet for service pension will be processed to PCDA (P), Allahabad through PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles for notification of PPO on receipt of pension documents from the applicant.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that from the above it is clear that delay in implementation of order is not due to any fault on the part of PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles, rather it is due to want of pension documents, therefore, physical presence of the former be dispensed with.</p> <p>This Execution Application has been filed for implementation of order dated 20.09.2017 in T.A. No. 133 of 2010. When order was not complied with for a considerable long time this Tribunal vide its order dated 24.11.2021</p>

directed PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles to remain personally present in the Tribunal on 24.01.2022 to explain the reason for non-compliance of the order. Despite the same when neither order was complied with, nor PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles appeared before the Tribunal to explain the reason, this Tribunal vide its order dated 31.01.2022 directed registry of this Tribunal to issue notice to PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles to appear in person on 14.03.2022 to file personal affidavit stating reason for non compliance of the order and to show cause why coercive action be not taken against him. Despite this order, the PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles is not present today, rather an affidavit has been filed by a Captain rank officer stating the reasons why order has not been complied with which is not acceptable. We are also of the view that since officer responsible for implementation of the order i.e. PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles has not complied with the order, despite more than four years having elapsed from the date of passing of the order, it would be appropriate to recover interest payable on arrears to the applicant from the pay of PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles.

We are informed that applicant has forwarded the pension documents to the Office of OIC Records through Zila Sainik Kalyan Evam Punarvas Adhikary, Auraiya District, Uttar Pradesh on 14.03.2022.

Respondents are directed to forwards the documents, on receipt, to the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts, Allahabad for generation of PPO at earliest preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt. They are further directed to calculate the amount of interest on arrears payable to the applicant and to recover the same from the salary of the PAO (OR), Rajaputana Rifles under intimation to this Tribunal.

A copy of this order be sent to The Controller General of Defence Accounts, New Delhi for information and necessary action.

A copy of this order be also sent to the Chief of the Army Staff for information and issuing suitable direction to all concerned authorities to avoid unnecessary delay in implementation of the order.

A copy of this order be given to the AFT Legal Cell also to communicate the same to all concerned.

List on **05.05.2022**.

**(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**  
**Court No.1**

**Original Application No. 801 of 2021**

**Ex. Hav. (Hony. Nb. Sub.) Vinod Kumar**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. Heard Shri V.P. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. The instant Original Application has been filed on behalf of the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, whereby the applicant has sought following reliefs:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) To issue./pass an order or direction to quash/set-aside the order dated 01 Sep 2017 contained in Annexure No. A-1 to the Original Application.</li><li>(b) To issue/pass an order or direction of appropriate nature to the respondents to grant the benefits of "rounding off" of the disability pension from 20% for life to 50% for life with effect from 01.01.1996 as provided vide policy of Government of India, Ministry of Defence.</li><li>(c) Any other relief as considered proper by this Hon'ble Tribunal be awarded in favour of the applicant.</li><li>(d) Cost of the O.A. be awarded to the applicant.</li></ul> <p>3. Briefly stated facts of the case are that the applicant was enrolled in the Army Ordnance Corps of Indian Army on 17.11.1970 and was discharged from service on 30.11.1992 (AN) in low medical category under Rule 13 (3) item III (i) of the Army Rules, 1954. The Release Medical Board identified his disability "<b>LIPROSY TUBERCULOID (TT)</b>" and assessed it @40% for two years, aggravated by military service. Accordingly, P.P.O. was issued by the Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension), Allahabad. Thereafter, the basis of recommendations of Re-Survey Medical Boards (RSMBs) the applicant has been granted disability pension upto to 23.03.2005. Last Re-Survey Medical Board held on 23.06.2003 assessed applicant's disability @20% for life. Accordingly, applicant was granted disability element of disability pension @20% for life with effect from 31.05.2005. Presently the applicant is in receipt</p>

of 20% disability pension for life and has moved this Original Application for grant of benefit of rounding off of disability pension from 20% to 50% for life.

4. Ld. Counsel for the applicant argued that since the applicant is already in receipt of 20% disability element for life, therefore, in view of the Hon'ble Apex Court judgment in the case of **Union of India and Ors vs Ram Avtar & ors** (Civil appeal No. 418 of 2012 decided on 10th December 2014), the applicant is also entitled to benefit of rounding off of disability element @ 50% for life.

5. On the other hand, though Ld. Counsel for the respondents conceded receipt of 20% disability pension by the applicant but contended that the applicant is not entitled to the benefit of rounding off of disability pension on the ground that the applicant's services were not cut short as he was not invalidated out on account of his disability. In the instant case the applicant was discharged from service on completion of his terms of engagement, therefore, he is not eligible for the benefit of rounding off.

6. The law on the point of rounding off of disability pension is no more RES INTEGRA in view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment in the case of **Union of India and Ors vs Ram Avtar & ors** (Civil appeal No 418 of 2012 decided on 10th December 2014) wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has nodded in disapproval of the policy of the Government of India in granting the benefit of rounding off of disability pension only to the personnel who have been invalidated out of service and denying the same to the personnel who have retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of their tenure of engagement. The relevant portion of the decision is excerpted below:-

*“4. By the present set of appeals, the appellant (s) raise the question, whether or not, an individual, who has retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of his tenure of engagement, if found to be suffering from some disability which is attributable to or aggravated by the military service, is entitled to be granted the benefit of rounding off of disability pension. The appellant(s) herein would contend that, on the basis of Circular No 1(2)/97/D (Pen-C) issued by the Ministry of Defence, Government of India, dated 31.01.2001, the aforesaid benefit is made available only to an Armed Forces Personnel who is invalidated out of service, and not to any other category of Armed Forces Personnel mentioned hereinabove.*

*5. We have heard Learned Counsel for the parties to the lis.*

*6. We do not see any error in the impugned judgment (s) and order(s) and therefore, all the appeals which pertain to the concept of rounding off of the disability pension are dismissed, with no order as to costs.*

*7. The dismissal of these matters will be taken note of by the High Courts as well as by the Tribunals in granting appropriate relief to the pensioners before them, if any, who are getting or are entitled to the disability pension.*

*8. This Court grants six weeks' time from today to the appellant(s) to comply with the orders and directions passed by us.”*

7. In the instant case, there is no dispute that applicant is in receipt of 20% disability element for life as this fact has been accepted by the respondents. In view of the settled law on this matter, we are of the considered opinion that the applicant is entitled to the benefit of rounding off to 50% for life with effect from

01.01.1996, however, arrears shall be restricted to three years only from the date original application is filed.

8. In view of the above, the Original Application No. 801 of 2021 is allowed. The applicant is held entitled to the benefit of rounding off of disability element from 20% for life to 50% for life with effect from three years prior to the date of filing of Original Application. The date of filing of Original Application is 03.12.2021. The respondents are directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date applicant submits mandatory documents along with certified copy of this order. Defaults will invite interest @ 8% per annum from the due date till actual payment.

9. 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**  
**Court No.1**

**Ex. A. No. 93 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 207 of 2021**

**Ex. Hav. Raut Dharmpal Nikanthrao**  
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><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Somesh Singh, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri R. Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Somesh Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This is an application for implementation of order dated 07.10.2021 in Original Application No. 207 of 2021.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that in compliance to order Government Sanction has been accorded on 08.02.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondents to file affidavit of compliance annexing therewith copy of PPO within four weeks from today.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on <b>25.04.2022</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b> Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

















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

**Ex. A. No. 86 of 2018 Inre : T.A. No. 595 of 2010**

**Vijay Keshav Singh**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Wg. Cdr. S.N. Dwivedi (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant, Shri Anurag Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 5, Shri Siddharth Dhaon, Ld. Counsel for the respondent No. 7, Ms. Shalini Chaudhary, Senior Manager, Canara Bank, Bidhuna Branch, District – Auraiya and Shri Rajeev Tiwari, Accounts Officer, Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Prayagraj (Allahabad) are present.</p> <p>An affidavit has been filed today by the respondent No. 7 which is taken on record.</p> <p>In regard to last date order of this Tribunal directing respondents to pay the amount to the applicant as directed in the order, the Ld. Counsel for the respondent No. 7 submits that as per PPO issued in the matter a sum of Rs.25,19,810/- was payable to the applicant as arrears. This amount was subject to Income Tax in tax bracket of 30%, therefore, a sum of Rs.5,75,581/- was deducted towards income tax under the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961 and paid to the Income Tax Department and the remaining amount was credited in the applicant's account. Ld. Counsel for the applicant further submits that the amount of the income tax once deducted and paid to the Income Tax Department can be claimed as refund from the Income Tax Department by the applicant only provided it was not payable as tax but in any case the respondent No. 7 cannot be directed to pay this amount to the applicant as it has already paid this amount to the Income Tax Department. Thus he submits that the order dated 18.02.2022 directing the respondent No.7 to pay the amount of Income Tax to the applicant be modified in the way that if amount was not deductible as tax the applicant can claim refund of the amount from the Income Tax Department.</p> <p>In turn, Ld. applicant's Counsel admits that the amount once deducted and paid to the Income Tax Department by the respondent No. 7 the same can be claimed as refund by the applicant only, the bank cannot claim the amount</p>

as refund. He submits that there will be no objection to the applicant if the order dated 18.02.2022 is modified in the way it is claimed, he will advice applicant to seek refund of the amount deducted towards the income tax.

From the facts stated in the affidavit filed today by the respondent No. 7 it may be noticed that a sum of Rs.5,75,581/- has been deducted towards income tax from the arrears payable to the applicant and paid to the Income Tax Department. It is also noticed that deduction has been made as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961 and once amount is deducted and paid it can be claimed as refund by the applicant only, provided it was not payable. The order therefore needs modification as bank cannot claim the refund.

Accordingly, order dated 18.02.2022 is modified in the way that respondent No. 7 is not liable to pay the amount of tax paid to Income Tax Department back to the applicant rather applicant can claim the amount as refund from the Income Tax Department if it was not payable. With this, order under execution seems to be complied with wherefore Execution Application may be dismissed being infructuous.

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**  
**Court No.1**

**Ex. A. No. 71 of 2021 Inre : O.A. No. 309 of 2018**

**Jamil Ahamad**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Satendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents submits that in compliance of the order PPO has been generated with its copy to the applicant. He also submits that RSMB could not be held in the matter due to applicant being bed-ridden. He also submits that affidavit of compliance is under preparation and will be filed within a week.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on <b>05.04.2022</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b> Member (A)                      <b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

















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

**O.A. No. 560 of 2021 with M.A. No. 208 of 2022**

**Ex. MWO (HFO) Sharwan 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><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p><b><u>M.A. No. 208 of 2022</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Amendment application filed by the applicant is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Ajit Singh Gaherwar and Shri S.N. Gaherwar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of amendment application, amendment application is <b>allowed</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let amendment be incorporated forthwith.</p> <p><b><u>O.A. No. 560 of 2021</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Counter Affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Ajit Singh Gaherwar and Shri S.N. Gaherwar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Original Application is <b>allowed</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For order, see our Judgment passed on separate sheets.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Misc. Application, if any, pending for disposal, shall be treated to have been disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p>AKD/-</p>



























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

**O.A. No. 535 of 2021 with M.A. No. 268 of 2022 & M.A. No. 269 of 2022**

**Ex. Sep Vijay Shankar Singh Yadava**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>Heard Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Jai Narayan Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents No. 1 to 4 and Shri D.C. Lohumi, learned counsel for the respondents No. 5 &amp; 6.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>M.A. No. 268 of 2022</u></b></p> <p>In view of order dated 10.01.2022 of the Hon'ble Apex Court on limitation due to COVID-19, there is no delay in filing recall application, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is <b>dismissed</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>M.A. No. 269 of 2022</u></b></p> <p>This is an application for recall of order dated 15.12.2021 passed in O.A. No. 535 of 2021 by which this Court had directed that O.A. shall proceed exparte against opposite Party No. 5 &amp; 6.</p> <p>Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, recall application is allowed.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed today by the respondents No. 5 &amp; 6 in the Court is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>O.A. No. 535 of 2021</u></b></p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that Rs. 12,93,512/- has been credited in the applicant's account on 31.12.2021 on account of war injury element and its arrears but no interest has been paid on delayed payment of amount to which applicant is entitled as per rules.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents No. 5 &amp; 6 submitted that war injury element could not be credited in applicant's pension account due to rectification in PPO and bank account number. Now, an amount of Rs. 12,93,512/- has been credited in applicant's account on 31.12.2021 and applicant is being paid war injury element as per PPO regularly and grievance of the applicant has been redressed.</p>

On perusal of record, we find that applicant has been paid war injury element and arrears after a lapse of 11 years for which applicant is entitled interest on delayed payment of arrears.

Accordingly, Bank concerned i.e. PDA of the applicant is directed to pay simple interest @ 6% per annum on delayed payment of arrears of war injury element to the applicant within a period of three months positively. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till actual payment

With the aforesaid direction, Original Application is **disposed off** finally.

**(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**

**O.A. No. 594 of 2021**

**Smt. Mamta Chauhan Widow of Late Maj Virendra**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>21.03.2022</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></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>On the request of learned counsel for the respondents and as a last chance, two weeks further time is granted to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>It is clarified that if counter affidavit is not filed within the time given, opportunity to file the same shall stand closed without any reference.</p> <p>List on <b>27.04.2022</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b>      <b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> <b>Member (A)</b>                                      <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p>SB</p>





























































