

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

O.A. No. 880 of 2021 with M.A. No. 429 of 2022 and M.A. No. 1042 of 2021

Lt. Col. Awadhesh 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>26.05.2022</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><u>M.A. No. 429 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 880 of 2021</u></p> <p>Heard Shri Puru Mudgal Advocate holding brief of Wg. Cdr. Ajit Kakkar (Retd.), learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This application has been filed to stay reassembly of General Court Martial in the matter of applicant Lieutenant Colonel Awadhesh Kumar Singh in regard to irregularities in demand of medical stores at Base Hospital, Lucknow. In regard to disciplinary proceedings applicant is attached with Dogra Regimental Centre, Faizabad.</p> <p>It is submitted that in regard to above disciplinary proceedings a GCM was convened wherein applicant had raised the plea in bar of trial under Army Rule 53(1)(c) on the ground that the period of limitation for trial as laid down in section 122 of the Indian Army Act has expired. The said plea in bar of trial was allowed by the GCM vide its detailed order dated 11.02.2022 and GCM was adjourned sine die. The order of the GCM was however not confirmed by the competent authority i.e. GOC-in-chief under section 153 of the Indian Army Act and the GCM has to be reassembled in the matter on 02.06.2022 to proceed with the trial. It is submitted that order dated 08.04.2022 of the competent authority not confirming the order dated 11.02.2022 of the GCM is wholly unjust and illegal as it is apparent from the facts of the case that limitation period of three years to begin with trial as provided under section 122 of the Indian Army Act will begin from 31.05.2018, the date when alleged irregularities and applicant's involvement therein came to knowledge and not from 24.01.2019.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant further submitted that in alleged irregularities several army officers are said to be involved and in respect of each of them GCM has been ordered separately. One of these officers namely Lt Col Pravesh Vasudeva had challenged his trial before Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh by means of O.A. (Appeal) No. 462 of</p>

2022 wherein firstly proceedings of the GCM were stayed and then finally the OA having been allowed GCM proceedings have been quashed. Copy of order dated 19.04.2022 of Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh has been filed as Annexure No. 2 to Interim Relief Application.

Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that O.A. in which interim relief application has been filed is not maintainable being filed against an interlocutory order and not against a final order. He submitted that when OA itself is not maintainable, any application made therein will also not be maintainable. For this he has placed reliance on orders dated 06.01.2022 and 06.04.2022 of this Bench in O.A. Nos. 01 of 2021, ***Nk Ali Anwarali Manwarali Vs UOI & Ors*** and 168 of 2022, ***Beena Dubey Vs UOI & Ors***. This Bench in the orders quoted above has said that an application filed under section 15 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 is maintainable against a final order only and not against every order in the garb of any order as provided in section 15(2) of the Act. Thus he submitted that interim relief application is liable to be dismissed being not maintainable.

During course of hearing, learned counsel for the respondents admitted that in respect of alleged irregularities Lt Col Parvesh Vasudevan is also facing a separate trial by GCM and that he had challenged the trial before Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh which has been allowed and matter has been remitted to court to hear afresh on plea in bar of trial.

The question before us to be decided is whether applicant's trial in regard to alleged irregularities in demand of medical stores at Base Hospital Lucknow is barred by time in view of section 122 of the Indian Army Act. This question has once been decided by the GCM in favour of the applicant vide order dated 11.02.2022. However, the said order being not confirmed by the GOC-in-Chief the GCM has been ordered to reassemble to proceed with trial against which the present application has been filed. Record of the case pertaining to the trial, which of course includes Col proceedings, are required for our perusal to decide the question before us. Application can not be dismissed in liminae being not maintainable being filed against an interlocutory order. The order dated 11.02.2022 of the GCM, if confirmed, had culminated the trial wherefore it is not an interlocutory order as respondents are claiming. Therefore, orders dated 06.01.2022 and 06.04.2022 of this Bench in O.A. Nos. 01 of 2021 and 168 of 2022 are not applicable in this case.

In view of the aforesaid, list on **11.07.2022** for hearing on interim relief application on which date respondents shall produce entire record of GCM including Col proceedings for perusal of the Bench. In the mean time further proceedings before GCM shall remain stayed.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.1
O.A. No. 249 of 2022

Col. Vikas Pandey
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>26.05.2022</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 interim relief filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Ashok Nigam, Senior Advocate assisted by Shri Prabhat Kumar Triparhi, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Applicant has filed the Original Application to quash an anonymous complaint dated 12.02.2022 filed against him by some imposter and to quash all proceedings initiated against him based on that complaint. Applicant has also prayed to grant interim relief allowing him to participate in the ensuing training (Higher Command Course Serial-51).</p> <p>It is submitted that an anonymous complaint has been received against the applicant which is dated 12.02.2022 and the respondents after having acted upon the said complaint initiated proceedings against the applicant, whereas in view of circulars issued by the Central Vigilance Commission no proceedings, what to say inquiry, can be initiated in respect of an anonymous complaint. It is further submitted that respondents taking cognizance of said anonymous complaint have not only initiated inquiry but they have also barred the applicant from participating in the ensuing training (Higher Command Course Serial-51) which is likely to be commence in June this year.</p> <p>In support of above, learned counsel for the applicant has drawn our attention to Annexure No-1, copy of letter dated 11 February 2022 regarding applicant's nomination for Higher Command Course Serial-51 and copy of CVC Circular No. 03/03/16 dated 7th March 2016 which reads that no action should be taken on anonymous/pseudonymous complaints and they should be simply filed.</p> <p>In reply, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that in organisational interest guidelines of CVC are duly abided, however, policies of Army Head Quarter clearly state, that if the facts of the complaint are</p>

verifiable, then the competent authority can take action on an anonymous complaint. He has referred AO 04/2000 and Letter No. A/56571/37/AG/DV-1(P) dated 25 June 2014.

In respect of anonymous complaint received against the applicant, he submitted that ONE MAN INQUIRY was held in the matter to verify the facts/allegations made in complaint and in the said inquiry prima facie the allegations have been substantiated and thereafter a Col has been ordered in the matter which is a fact finding inquiry based on evidence collected during inquiry. He submitted that applicant is not cooperating in the inquiry citing illness.

In support, copy of letter referred to above and copy of ONE MAN INQUIRY report have been filed as Annexure-1 & Annexure-4 to the reply filed against interim relief application.

Upon hearing submissions of learned counsel of both sides and having gone through material available on record we find that between 29 July 2020 to 04 October 2021 applicant was posted as Commanding Officer 503 ASC Battalion in Leh-Ladakh. During this period he opened a current account in the name of his unit. This was a single account operated by the applicant himself and during the above period some financial transactions took place as money was credited and debited from the account.

We further find that in respect of above account an anonymous complaint dated 12.02.2022 was received against the applicant having verifiable contents. Accordingly, ONE MAN INQUIRY was ordered which on inquiry has substantiated the allegations in the complaint. Based on the report of ONE MAN INQUIRY a Col has been ordered which is a fact finding inquiry based on evidence collected during inquiry. As per reply, applicant is not cooperating in the inquiry.

We further find that applicant has been nominated for Higher Command Course which is scheduled to commence in June. We also find that if Col is not completed before the commencement of above course applicant will not be permitted to participate in the course which will certainly affect his future career as he may not be promoted to the higher rank. We can also observe that if inquiry is completed before the commencement of course and applicant is given clean chit in the inquiry then only applicant may be allowed for the course.

Now in the aforesaid facts and circumstances it is to be seen whether actions initiated against the applicant are bad in view of CVC Circular quoted above and applicant should be permitted to participate in the Higher Command Course or are they are justified and need no interference.

One Man Inquiry report reveals that during posting in Leh-Ladakh applicant opened a current account in the name of Regiment in Yes bank whereas official account in the name of his Regiment is opened in State Bank

of India. It is also to be noted that one account in the name of Regiment was already opened in SBI and on that count there was no reason to open any other account. The newly opened account was singly operated whereas Regiment account is always jointly operated. We also observe that there a high value transaction in this account.

In regard to account in Yes bank, learned counsel for the applicant admitted during course of argument that it was a private account operated by the applicant alone which raised a serious doubt that if it was a private account then why it was opened in the name of Regiment. This makes account suspicious and prima facie supports the allegations made in complaint. Further, if being Commanding Officer of the unit any suspicious act is done the same needs inquiry and complaint made in this regard can not be discarded being anonymous.

Applicant's non cooperation in Col also raises doubt about his genuineness. His contention that he is being harassed and humiliated in the name of inquiry is unsubstantiated as there is nothing on record to highlight respondents prejudices against the applicant. Be that as it may, we find that at para 4 of the Nomination letter dated 11.02.2022 for officer selected for the AHCC etc., it is mentioned that the final nomination for the course is subject to continued good performance and that the officer should not be involved in any disciplinary case. From the foregoing it amply clear that the applicant has been subject to an Inquiry and as such this is tantamount to being "involved" in a disciplinary case. On this ground, therefore, the respondents are right in withholding the applicant from attending the AHCC commencing in June, 2022. Moreover, during pendency of inquiry applicant can not be permitted to participate in the Higher Command Course. However, once inquiry is completed and nothing incriminating is found against the applicant then certainly he may be allowed to participate in the one next year (2023) if not permissible in the ensuing one i.e. 2022.

In view of the aforesaid discussions, we find that applicant has not been able to make out any case for the grant of interim relief. Accordingly, interim relief application is **dismissed**.

O.A. 249 of 2022

Case needs adjudication.

Admit.

Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and granted four weeks time to file Counter Affidavit. Thereafter applicant will have two weeks time to file rejoinder.

List the matter before Registrar on **02.08.2022** for exchange of pleadings.

List the matter before Tribunal on **29.08.2022**.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

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

O.A. No. (A) No. 441 of 2022 with M.A. No. 502 of 2022

Rect. Vivek Kumar
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>26.05.2022</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><u>M.A. No. 502 of 2022</u></p> <p>Heard Shri Puru Modgal, Advocate holding brief of Wg. Cdr. Ajit Kakkar (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This application has been filed in Original Application No. 441 of 2022 seeking order to release the applicant Recruit Vivek Kumar on bail during pendency of the Original Application.</p> <p>In the Original Application the applicant has challenged the order dated 31st January 2022 of the District Court Martial by which applicant has been punished on two charges under section 69 of the Indian Army Act, 1950 and sentenced to suffer (1) rigorous imprisonment for two years and (2) to be dismissed from the service.</p> <p>It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that convening order dated 27.11.2021 and charge sheet dated 24.11.2021, issued by the authorities at BEG & Centre, Roorkee hold no legal sanctity as they have been issued after the charges were framed against the applicant in the court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Roorkee vide order dated 05.12.2018 and, in view of which, all actions taken by the respondents are violative of section 125 of the Indian Army Act as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in "GOC Vs CBI & Another", (2012) 5 SCR 599. He further submitted that entire DCM proceedings are void being barred by time under section 122 of the Indian Army Act. He further submitted that applicant has been punished with only two years rigorous imprisonment and he is in custody since 31.01.2018 and if he is not enlarged on bail during pendency of Original Application the purpose of appeal filed under section 15 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 would be defeated.</p>

Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that Original Application in which the bail application has been filed is not maintainable being filed against the order of District Court Martial which has not yet achieved finality being not confirmed by the competent authority. He submitted that unless the appeal filed under section 15 of the AFT Act, 2007 is maintainable any application filed under that appeal would not be maintainable. Thus, he submitted that bail application is liable to be dismissed on this score only. In support, he has placed reliance on the Judgment of Armed Forces Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi dated 07.04.2015 in Original Application No. 176 of 2015, titled ***Hav. Sham Das D Versus Union of India & Others.***

Learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that charges labelled against the applicant were serious in nature for which he was tried and convicted, as in trial both charges had been found proved. Applicant has committed a civil offence as he made sexually coloured remarks on Miss 'X' and when this offence came to notice of the authority competent to initiate action he voluntarily caused grievous injury to a Major (now Lieutenant Colonel) by fracturing his finger and inflicting injuries on his head.

In rejoinder, Ld. Counsel for the applicant has placed reliance on the order dated 11.08.2021 of Armed Forces Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi in Original Application (Appeal) No. 1053 of 2021, titled Ex. Sub. Maj. C. Ravi Versus Union of India & Others and has submitted that in case of conviction in Court Martial proceedings Tribunal is competent to enlarge the convict on bail pending confirmation of sentence.

Upon hearing submissions of learned counsel of both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we observe that the appeal in which the bail application has been filed has been filed against order dated 31.01.2022 of the District Court Marital which has not yet been confirmed by the competent authority under section 153 of the Army Act despite passage of about four months. We further observe that there is no time limit for confirmation of the order passed by the court-martial, however, it is obligatory for the authority concerned to pass the order at earliest, more so when offender is in custody so that appeal, if any, preferred against the order may not be frustrated.

We further observe that keeping in view that applicant was in close custody during trial and now in regular custody after being convicted by the DCM, it was obligatory on the part of competent authority to pass the order under section 153 of the Army Act at earliest which he has failed for no valid reason. Thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on bail during pendency of appeal instead of deliberating on maintainability of appeal because object and purpose of law is to impart justice rather declining the same on technicalities.

Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. Let applicant Recruit Vivek Kumar be enlarged on bail during pendency of appeal (OA) on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs 50000/= stating that he will appear before the Tribunal on every date personally or through his Counsel and in the event of Original Application being dismissed he will present himself before the authority concerned to serve the punishment and one surety in like amount to the satisfaction of Registrar of this Tribunal.

Bail application stands **disposed of**.

(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. 182 of 2022 with M.A. No. 487 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 117 of 2018

Smt. Sumitra Devi W/o Late Ex. WO Shyamala Prasad Singh 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>26.05.2022</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 Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, 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 Shri Amit Pandey, Shri Shiv Kant Pandey and Ms. Nisha Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents that in compliance to order dated 07.04.2021 of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 117 of 2018 a letter has already been issued to the Chief Manager, State Bank of India, CPPC, 24 Mahatma Gandhi Marg, Halwasiya Market, Hazaratganj, Lucknow to revise the pension of the applicant as per Circular No. 568 dated 13.10.2016 issued by the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Prayagraj.</p> <p>In regard to above letter, the submission of Shri Rajeev Tiwari, Accounts Officer, Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Prayagraj is that Office of Chief Manager, State Bank of India, CPPC is situated in Prayagraj and not in Lucknow. This shows that letter has been wrongly addressed.</p> <p>In regard to above letter, the submission of Shri Rajeev Tiwari, Accounts Officer, Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Prayagraj is that Office of Chief Manager, State Bank of India, CPPC is situated in Prayagraj and not in Lucknow. This shows that letter has been wrongly addressed and sent.</p> <p>Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 to address the letter correctly and send it on correct address within a week.</p> <p>An application has been filed by the applicant seeking permission to implead Chief Manager, CPPC, State Bank of India and Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Bamrauli as party in the Execution Application. In this application also the address of the Chief Manager, CPPC, State Bank of India has been wrongly shown which needs to be corrected. Accordingly, let it be corrected in the application today.</p> <p>The impleadment application is allowed and applicant is permitted to implead the Chief Manager, CPPC, State Bank of India, 4 Kutchery Road, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh-211002 and Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Bamrauli Branch, Prayagraj as respondent Nos. 5 and 6 in the Execution Application.</p> <p>Let amendments be made today itself and thereafter notices be sent to newly impleaded respondents to file affidavit of compliance in the matter within four weeks.</p> <p>Steps for notice be taken within a week.</p> <p>List on 03.08.2022.</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
Court No.1

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>26.05.2022</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 Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents assisted by Shri Rajeev Tiwari, Accounts Officer, PCDA (Pension), Prayagraj.</p> <p>Affidavit of compliance filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that order under execution has not been fully and correctly complied with as in compliance respondents are making recovery of service element already paid to the applicant for the period from 18.07.1997 to 30.11.2014 and interest paid on arrears of disability pension for the period from 01.01.1996 till date of order i.e. 27.04.2018. He submitted that it is nowhere stated in the order that applicant is entitled to service element with effect from 01.12.2014, rather the order clearly states that it is payable from the date disability element was payable. As regards recovery of interest, he submitted that no recovery can be made. However, he conceded that as per order interest on arrears is payable from the date of order.</p> <p>In reply, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submitted that interest on arrears cannot be made payable from the date of entitlement, it is payable from the date of order i.e. 27.04.2018.</p> <p>As regards service element, the Ld. Counsel admitted that there is nothing in the order which could entail. As per order it is payable from the date of entitlement of disability element.</p> <p>Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides and going through the order we find that applicant is entitled to service element with effect from the date of entitlement of the disability element as it is one of the two components of the disability pension. Therefore, any recovery of service element already paid to the applicant is bad, respondents are directed not to</p>

make any recovery of the service element and, if any such recovery has been made, to refund the same to the applicant forthwith.

As regards interest on arrears, it is clear from the order that it is payable from the date of order when compliance of the order is not made within time given in the order and not with effect from any previous date. Therefore, if any payment has been made to the applicant from a previous date the same is recoverable from the applicant.

In view of the aforesaid, respondents are directed to correct the PPO issued in the matter and to file fresh affidavit of compliance annexing therewith corrected copy of PPO within four weeks from today.

List on **25.08.2022**.

Let copy of this order be given to the Ld. Counsel for the respondents/AFT Legal Cell to ensure compliance of the order.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

AKD/-

