

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

Ex. A. No. 11 of 2022 with M.A. No. 137 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 619 of 2021

Brig. Javed Iqbal
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>25.04.2022</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: justify;">Heard Shri R Chandra, learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Written arguments filed by the applicant is taken on the record.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">In written arguments the applicant has stated that execution application be decided directing the respondents to implement the order dated 07.01.2021 in O.A. No.619 of 2021 by which the respondents have been directed to promote the applicant to the post of Additional Major General(Litigation) in Judge Advocate General's Branch with all consequential benefits forthwith with effect from 05.05.2021.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">It has been stated that respondents are misusing the liberty granted by the Tribunal by intentionally not implementing the order despite the fact that implementation of the order is not stayed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the civil appeal which the respondents have filed against the judgement and order of this Tribunal. It has been further stated that civil appeal is listed for final hearing before the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 04.05.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Dr Shailendra Sharma Atal, learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that civil appeal was listed for hearing in the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 11.04.2022 on which date respondents were allowed to file rejoinder affidavit within two weeks and appeal was listed for final hearing on 04.05.2022.Thus he submits that since the matter is subjudice before higher forum, hearing in the execution case be adjourned.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Brigadier Javed Iqbal is also present during course of hearing and he submits that respondents have not yet filed rejoinder affidavit and, if hearing is adjourned due to matter being subjudice before Hon'ble Supreme Court, a rider should be imposed against the respondents to avoid misuse of such liberty any further.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Considering that matter is subjudice before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and is listed for final hearing on 04.05.2022, we think it appropriate to list this matter for hearing after the date fixed in the Hon'ble Supreme Court.</p>

This Tribunal vide its order dated 22.03.2022 had directed the Military Secretary (MS) Lt. Gen. P.G.K. Menon, the officer responsible for the implementation of the order, to appear before the Tribunal in person on 29.03.2022 and to file his personal affidavit stating the reasons why contempt proceedings be not initiated against him for non compliance of the order of the Tribunal. Only the order of physical presence of the above said Military Secretary was later stayed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 28.03.2022 in Civil Appeal Diary No(s) 8305 of 2022 and not the order of filing personal affidavit of the Military Secretary.

Respondents are therefore directed to file personal affidavit of the Military Secretary by the next date fixed in the matter.

Respondents may also file reply to the arguments filed by the applicant.

List on **17.05.2022**.

A copy of the order be provided to AFT Legal Cell(Army) to communicate this order to all concerned.

(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 (E-Court)

O.A. No. 10 of 2018

Smt. Suman Devi & Others W/o YPS Chauhan (Deceased) 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>25.04.2022</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 R.C. Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>List on 07.07.2022.</p> <p>On the date fixed respondents shall produce original documents pertaining to the case for perusal of the Bench.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>AKD/-</p>

By Circulation
(E-Court)

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

R.A. No.39 of 2022 with M.A. No. 354 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 688 of 2021

Union of India and Others

Review Applicants

Versus

Ex. Nk. Neer Pal Singh

Respondent

By Legal Practitioner for Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>25.04.2022</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>The file has been placed before us by Circulation.</p> <p>In view of order dated 10.01.2022 of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Miscellaneous Application No. 21/2022 in MA 665/2021 in Suo Motu Writ Petition (C) No.3/2020, there is no delay in filing of Review Application, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is dismissed.</p> <p>The Review Applicants – Union of India & Others have filed this application under Rule 18 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 by which applicants have prayed for review and setting aside the judgement and order dated 21.01.2022 of this Tribunal passed in Original Application No. 688 of 2021 by means of which shortfall of 04 months in minimum qualifying service of the respondent (applicant in Original Application) in getting second service pension was condoned and he was held entitled to get second service pension in DSC as well in addition to pension which he is already getting from the Army and the review applicants (respondents in Original Application) were directed to pay arrears of second service pension from the date of notionally completion of 15 years of service.</p> <p>It is a settled proposition of law that the scope of the review is limited and until it is shown that there is error apparent on the face of record in the judgment and order sought to be reviewed, the same cannot be reviewed. For ready reference, Order 47, Rule 1 sub-rule (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 is reproduced below :-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“1. Application for review of judgment.- (1) any person considering himself aggrieved-</i> <i>(a) by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred,</i> <i>(b) by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed, or</i></p>

(c) by a decision on a reference from a Court of Small Causes, and who, from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record , or for any other sufficient reason, desires to obtain a review of the decree passed or order made against him, may apply for a review of judgment to the Court which passed the decree or made the order.”

In view of the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions, it is settled that the scope of review jurisdiction is very limited and re-hearing is not permissible. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Para 9 of its judgment in the case of ***Parsion Devi and others vs. Sumitri Devi and others***, reported in (1997) 8 Supreme Court Cases 715, has observed as under :-

“9. Under Order 47, Rule 1 CPC a judgment may be open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record. An error which is not self- evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record justifying the court to exercise its power of review under Order 47, Rule 1 CPC. In exercise of the jurisdiction under Order 47, Rule 1 CPC it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be "reheard and corrected". There is a clear distinction between an erroneous decision and an error apparent on the face of the record. While the first can be corrected by the higher forum, the latter only can be corrected by exercise of the review jurisdiction. A review petition has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be "an appeal in disguise."

We have gone through the judgment and order sought to be reviewed and no illegality or irregularity or error apparent on the face of record being found therein, we are of the view that there is no force in the grounds taken in the review application so that order may be reviewed.

In the result, Review Application is **rejected**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

AKD/-