

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

O.A. No. 723 of 2021

Brig. Saif UI Islam Khan (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>27.05.2022</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>Counter Affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record. Heard Shri S.G. Singh and Shri Anand Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, 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
Court No.1
O.A. No. 438 of 2022 with M.A. No. 495 of 2022

Ex. Gnr. Yogendra Singh
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Chief of the Army Staff & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 Shri Pushpendra Mishra, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Rohit Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Pushpendra Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Applicant has filed this Original Application for the grant of disability pension. It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that applicant has been invalidated out from service being in low medical category. It is further submitted that being invalidated out from service due to low medical category applicant is entitled to disability pension as per Entitlement Rules.</p> <p>There being a delay of 32 years, 01 month and 14 days in filing of Original Application, an application for condonation of delay has been filed, which is supported with affidavit. In the affidavit applicant has stated that delay in filing of Original Application is not intentional, but for the reasons stated therein, wherefore, delay in filing Original Application be condoned and Original Application be admitted for hearing.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents has vehemently opposed the prayer on the premise that delay has not been properly and satisfactorily explained. He further submitted that all original documents pertaining to applicant including medical documents have been destroyed as per Rule as in the case of non-pensioner the retention period of documents is 25 years.</p> <p>Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case we find that there is a long delay of more than 32 years in filing of Original Application regarding which no satisfactory explanation has been offered by the applicant. We also find that if an application is to be filed in a given time provided in the statute and the same is not file within said time, the delay has to be properly and satisfactorily explained on day to day basis which the applicant has failed in the present case. Therefore, we are of the considered view that delay in filing of Original Application is not condonable.</p> <p>Accordingly, delay condonation application is dismissed.</p> <p>Original Application being time barred is also dismissed.</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

O.A. No. 439 of 2022 with M.A. No. 496 of 2022

Col. Shishir Srivastava
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri B.K. Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">It is a fit case for adjudication.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Admit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">List the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List the matter before Tribunal on 24.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) 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. 440 of 2022 with M.A. No. 497 of 2022

Smt. Sapna Devi W/o Ex. NC (E) K. Raju
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: justify;">Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Amit Jaiswal, 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 style="text-align: justify;">Heard Wg. Cdr. A.K. Singh (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Applicant, who is wife of Ex. NC (E) K. Raju, has filed this Original Application for the grant of family pension.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that applicant's husband is missing since 09.07.2010. It is further submitted that if a question arises whether a man is alive or dead, and it is proved that he has not been heard of for seven years by those who would naturally have heard of him if he had been alive, the burden of proving that he is alive is shifted to the person who affirms it. Thus, he submitted that applicant's husband is missing since 09.07.2010 and he has not been heard by anyone he should be presumed dead and applicant should be entitled to family pension.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">In reply, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submitted that applicant's husband was not a pensioner as he has been dismissed from service being deserter. He further submitted that order of dismissal has not been challenged in the Original Application wherefore, it is not maintainable.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">In view of the above, Ld. Counsel for the applicant to make clear that when order of dismissal of applicant's husband has not been challenged in the Original Application then how it is maintainable for the grant of family pension.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">List on 02.08.2022 for hearing on the above issue.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p> <p style="text-align: left;">AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 443 of 2022 with M.A. No. 503 of 2022

Ex. Hav. Abhiram Goldar
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>27.05.2022</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 Mrs. Anju Singh, 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 Dr. Amit Asthana, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs. Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</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 Original Application, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is dismissed.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension.</p> <p>Matter 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 the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p>List the matter before Tribunal on 24.08.2022.</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

O.A. No. 444 of 2022

Smt. Rajani Devi W/o Ex. Rfn. Dinesh Kumar Solanki 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>27.05.2022</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 Shri J.N. 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 K.K. Misra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri J.N. Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of Special Family Pension.</p> <p>Matter 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 the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p>List the matter before Tribunal on 24.08.2022.</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

O.A. No. 445 of 2022 with M.A. No. 504 of 2022

Ex. Sub. Braj Bhan Sachan	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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-indent: 40px;">Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, 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 style="text-indent: 40px;">Heard Shri Virat Anand Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">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 Original Application, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is dismissed.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">Admit.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">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 style="text-indent: 40px;">List the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">List the matter before Tribunal on 24.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> (Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J) </p> <p style="font-size: small;">AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 448 of 2022 with M.A. No. 507 of 2022

HFO Jagdish Singh Chauhan (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>27.05.2022</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 Mrs. Appoli Srivastava, 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 Rang Nath Pandey and Shri Rahul Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs. Appolit Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</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 Original Application, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is dismissed.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension.</p> <p>Matter 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 the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p>List the matter before Tribunal on 24.08.2022.</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

O.A. No. 449 of 2022 with M.A. No. 508 of 2022

Ex. JWO Sanjeet 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>27.05.2022</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 Shri Rajeev Narayan Pandey, 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 Ved Prakash Pandey and Shri R.K. Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajeev Narayan Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</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 Original Application, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is dismissed.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension.</p> <p>Matter 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 the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p>List the matter before Tribunal on 24.08.2022.</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

O.A. No. 450 of 2022

Ex. Sep/MT Dushyant Pratap 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>27.05.2022</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 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 Col. Ravindra Nath Tiwari (Retd.) and Col. H.M. Maheshwari (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Shyam Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed for the grant of disability pension.</p> <p>Matter 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 the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p>List the matter before Tribunal on 24.08.2022.</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. 173 of 2022 inre : O.A. No. 235 of 2020

Pradeep Kumar S/o Late Ex. Hav. Gopal Das
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>27.05.2022</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 Shri Anurag 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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashok Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Anurag Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>This application has been filed for implementation of order dated 28.10.2021 of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 235 of 2020.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to seek instruction and to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 22.08.2022 .</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. 188 of 2022 inre : O.A. No. 78 of 2021

Ex. Sub. Nathuni Yadav
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Memo of Appearance filed by Dr. S.N. Pandey, 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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri K.P. Datta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. S.N. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This application has been filed for implementation of order dated 09.09.2021 of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 78 of 2021.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to seek instruction and to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 23.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) 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. 189 of 2022 inre : O.A. No. 444 of 2019

Ex. MWO Hari Narayan Shukla
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>27.05.2022</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 Shri Ramesh Chandra Shukla, 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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Sudhir Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ramesh Chandra Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>This application has been filed for implementation of order dated 11.10.2021 of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 444 of 2019</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to seek instruction and to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 23.08.2022.</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

M.A. No. 468 of 2022 with M.A. No. 469 of 2022 Inre : T.A. No. 1400 of 2010

Chandra Shekhar 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>27.05.2022</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 Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, 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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashok Kumar , Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>This application has been filed for recall the order dated 11.11.2010 of this Tribunal in Transferred Application No. 1400 of 2010, Chandra Shekhar Singh Versus Union of India & Others by means of which Transferred Application has been dismissed in default.</p> <p>There is a delay of 09 years, 05 months and 23 days in filing of recall application regarding which an application for condonation of delay has been filed.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted two weeks time to file objection against delay condonation application.</p> <p>List on 26.07.2022.</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

M.A. No. 498 of 2022 with M.A. No. 499 of 2022 Inre : T.A. No. 6 of 2021

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants

Applicants

Versus

Ex. Sgt. Somdatt Awasthi

By Legal Practitioner for Respondent

Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align:center">Heard Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the applicants</p> <p style="text-align:center">The applicants – Union of India & Others have filed this application seeking leave to appeal against decision of this Tribunal dated 28.02.2022 of this Tribunal in Transferred Application No. 06 of 2021.</p> <p style="text-align:center">There being a delay of one month and 21 days in filing of Leave to Appeal, a delay condonation application has been filed wherein the applicant has stated that delay in filing of application is not deliberate.</p> <p style="text-align:center">We have gone through the facts stated in affidavit filed in support of application and we find that cause shown for the delay is not sufficient. Therefore, delay in filing of application is not condonable.</p> <p style="text-align:center">In the result, delay condonation application is dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align:center">Leave to Appeal being time barred is also dismissed.</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

M.A. No. 500 of 2022 with M.A. No. 501 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 264 of 2020

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants

Applicants

Versus

Ex. Hav. Narendra Singh
By Legal Practitioner for Respondent

Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Anurag Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicants</p> <p>The applicants – Union of India & Others have filed this application seeking leave to appeal against decision of this Tribunal dated 13.10.2021 of this Tribunal in Transferred Application No. 06 of 2021.</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 Leave to Appeal, however, an application for condonation of delay has been moved which being not required is dismissed.</p> <p>Upon hearing submission of Ld. Counsel for the applicants – Union of India & Others, we find that no point of law of general public importance is involved in the decision so that leave may be granted to the applicants to file Appeal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In the result, Leave to Appeal is also dismissed.</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

M.A. No. 506 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 735 of 2021

Ex. Nk. Ris Ram Babu

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>27.05.2022</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. S.N. Pandey, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Alok Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. S.N. Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>For the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of application, correction application is allowed.</p> <p>In the order dated 09.03.2022 the name of Counsel for the applicant be corrected as "Shri Alok Kumar Singh" in place of "Shri Ashok Kumar Singh".</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. 95 of 2018 Inre : O.A. No. 143 of 2015

Shaikh Ibrahim

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Versus

Chief of Army Staff & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Rohit Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As prayed by the Ld. Counsel for the respondents, two weeks further time is granted to bring the letter on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 22.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p style="text-align: left; margin-left: 20px;">AKD/-</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 04 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 73 of 2020

Smt. Sunita Devi W/o Late Ex. Dfr. Kishor 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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Affidavit of compliance filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Gyan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">During course of hearing, Ld. Counsel for the respondents submitted that in compliance of order under execution PPO has been generated, a copy whereof has been forwarded to the applicant.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of applicant admitted that copy of PPO has been received by the applicant.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">We have gone through the copy of PPO annexed with affidavit of compliance and we find that it is in terms of the order which shows that order has been complied with.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Accordingly, Execution Application is dismissed being rendered infructuous with direction to Pension Disbursing Authority to ensure payment to the applicant as per PPO.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> (Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J) </p> <p style="text-align: left; margin-top: 10px;">AKD/-</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 16 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 174 of 2015

Ex. Nk. Jageshwar Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant
Versus
Officer In Charge, The Records Signals & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Virendra Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant, Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 assisted by Shri Rajeev Tiwari, Accounts Officer, PCDA (P) Prayagraj and Shri D.C. Lohumi, Ld. Counsel for the respondent No. 4 (Bank) are present.</p> <p>It is submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 that affidavit of compliance will be filed in the registry today during course of the day.</p> <p>List on 19.07.2022.</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. 99 of 2022 Inre : T.A. No. 1283 of 2010

Ex. Sep. Indrajeet Kumar By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant	Versus	Applicant
Union of India & Others By Legal Practitioner for Respondents		Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal		
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents assisted by Shri Rajeev Tiwari, Accounts Officer, PCDA (P), Prayagraj.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No affidavit of compliance has been filed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let it be filed within two weeks after serving its copy to the Ld. Counsel for the applicant, who will have, on receipt of copy, two weeks time to file objection, if any.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 22.08.2022.</p> <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 20px;"><tr><td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</td><td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</td></tr></table> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">AKD/-</p>	(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)
(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

Ex. A. No. 97 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 307 of 2021

Sep. MT Mukesh 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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing no one is present on behalf of the applicant.</p> <p>Shri Kaushik Chatterjee, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present and submits that copy of affidavit of compliance has been sent to the Ld. Counsel for the applicant through e. Mail.</p> <p>No hard copy of the affidavit of compliance has been furnished to the Ld. Counsel for the applicant.</p> <p>Let it be furnished within a week. Thereafter, applicant will have two weeks time to file objection, if any.</p> <p>List on 23.08.2022.</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

O.A. No. 446 of 2022

Ex. Sub. Ramagya Singh Kushwaha
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>27.05.2022</u></p> <p><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 Ashish Kumar 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 Wg. Cdr. Ajit Kakkar (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Matter 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 the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p>List the matter before Tribunal on 01.09.2022.</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**

O.A. No. 447 of 2022

Ex. Sub. Sanaulla Khan	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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-indent: 40px;">Memo of Appearance filed by Mrs. Kavita Mishra, 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 style="text-indent: 40px;">Heard Wg. Cdr. Ajit Kakkar (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs. Kavita Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">Admit.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">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 style="text-indent: 40px;">List the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p style="text-indent: 40px;">List the matter before Tribunal on 01.09.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p style="text-align: left;">AKD/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 452 of 2022

Ex. Sub. Maj. Rajmani Tripathi
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Shrikant Mishra and Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">At the very outset it was submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant that Original Application may be dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Accordingly, Original Application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh.</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

O.A. No. 453 of 2022

Ex. Sigm. Birjesh Yadav
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Adesh Kumar Gutpa, 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 style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi and Shri Anshuman Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Matter needs adjudication. Admit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">List the matter before Registrar on 29.07.2022 for exchange of pleadings.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List the matter before Tribunal on 01.09.2022.</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

O.A. No. 451 of 2022

JWO Nitin Tiwari
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>27.05.2022</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 Shri Rajiv Pandey, Advocate on behalf of the respondent Nos. 1 to 4 is taken on record. His name be shown as Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 4 when the case is listed next.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Ms. Upasna Mishra and Shri Kapil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajiv Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>This Original Application has been filed by the applicant against the order dated 08.09.2021 of respondent No. 2 by which deduction is being made towards maintenance allowance to respondent No. 5.</p> <p>Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p>Admit.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 4 seeks and is allowed four weeks time to file Counter Affidavit.</p> <p>Issue notice to respondent No.5 returnable within four weeks.</p> <p>Steps for notice be taken within a week.</p> <p>List on 24.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) 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. 172 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 428 of 2017

Ex. Sep. Gaya 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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashok Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>This application has been filed for implementation of order dated 26.10.2021 of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 428 of 2017.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents seeks and is allowed four weeks time to seek instruction and to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 23.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p><small>AKD/-</small></p>

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

M.A. No. 511 of 2022 with M.A. No. 512 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 404 of 2021

Ex. Gentleman Cadet (GC) Anshuman Rawat 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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: justify;">Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Rajesh Shukla, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra and Ms. Upasna Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajesh Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Applicant has filed this application seeking leave to appeal against decision of this Tribunal dated 05.04.2022 in Original Application No.404 of 2021 by which Original Application has been dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">There being a delay of eighteen days in filing of Leave to Appeal, an application for condonation of delay has been filed, which is supported with affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">In affidavit filed in support of delay condonation application applicant has stated that delay in filing of Original Application is not intentional.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Ld. Counsel for the respondents has vehemently opposed the prayer and has submitted that no point of law of general public importance is involved in the matter so that leave to file appeal may be granted. He has further submitted that delay in filing of leave to appeal has not been properly and satisfactorily explained.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Upon hearing submissions of Ld. Counsel of both sides and considering the facts and circumstances of the case we find that delay in filing of Original Application has not been properly and satisfactorily explained.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">In the result, delay condonation application is dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">We further find that no point of law of general public importance is involved in the matter so that leave to appeal may be granted.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">In the result, Leave to Appeal is also dismissed being barred by time and on merit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p style="text-align: left;">AKD/-</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 108 of 2022 Inre : O.A. No. 260 of 2021 along with R.A. No. 48 of 2022

Col. (TS) Nagendra 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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align:center">Heard Shri R. Chadra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p><u>R.A. No. 48 of 2022</u></p> <p style="text-align:center">On perusal of order dated 10.11.2021 passed in O.A. No. 260 of 2021 by this Tribunal, we find that disability element has been granted for disability 2 and 3 only for which net assessment for disability 2 and 3 is 40% and accordingly, applicant is entitled to disability element @ 40% rounded off to 50% for life whereas applicant has been granted disability element @ 50% rounded off to 75% erroneously which needs to be corrected.</p> <p style="text-align:center">Therefore, Review Application is allowed and paras 11 and 12 of the order dated 10.11.2021 passed in O.A. No. 260 of 2021 are amended to read as under :-</p> <p style="text-align:center">For – “disability element @ 50% for life to be rounded off to 75% for life”.</p> <p style="text-align:center">Read – “disability element @ 40% for life which would stand rounded off to 50% for life”.</p> <p style="text-align:center">Let amended copy of order be provided to learned counsel for the respondents/AFT Legal Cell to ensure compliance.</p> <p><u>Ex. A. No. 108 of 2022</u></p> <p style="text-align:center">Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p style="text-align:center">List on 08.09.2022.</p> <p style="text-align:center">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 111 of 202 Inre : O.A. No. 38 of 2021

Swamy Nath S/o Late Ex. Nk. Bagedu 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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri R. Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Manu Kumar Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>There are discrepancies in the documents which the applicant has submitted for issuance of PPO, such as in the service records of the applicant's father, date of birth has been mentioned 16.04.1992 whereas it is 25.09.1994. There is also variance in the spellings of applicant's name in the Adhaar Card and in the service records and apart from this, applicant has not submitted details of her mother who was a family pensioner after the death of father, rather he has submitted details of his father which are not required. Applicant has also not submitted non employment certificate.</p> <p>In reply, learned counsel for the applicant submitted that in High School certificate his date of birth is 25.09.1994 and not 16.04.1992 as respondents state. He further submitted that variation in his name is of no relevance, it is SWANY NATH in the High School certificate. He has also submitted that there is no relevance in explanation of delay for grant of family pension to him when the claim has already allowed by the Tribunal.</p> <p>Upon hearing submissions of both sides, we find that order in question has not being complied with by the respondents on trivial issues which are not relevant. However, keeping in view objections raised by the respondents, applicant is directed to file a notarised affidavit in the Record Office regarding his name, date of birth and details of his mother within a week from today.</p> <p>After affidavit being filed, respondents to process matter immediately for generations of PPO and will ensure that it is issued within four weeks.</p> <p>List on 23.08.2022.</p> <p>Let copy of order be provided to learned counsel for the applicant and learned counsel for the respondents/AFT Legal Cell to ensure compliance.</p> <p style="text-align:right">(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

O.A. No. 365 of 2021 with M.A. No. 470 of 2022

Ex,. Sep/ASH Balbir 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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Ashok Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents No. 1 to 3.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>M.A. No. 470 of 2022</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">This is an application seeking amendments in pleadings in the Original Application.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">By means of amendment, applicant wants to delete para 4(2), 4(10) and ground (F) and in their place, fresh paras 4(2), 4(10) and ground (F) are to be inserted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">During the course of hearing, when it was pointed out by learned counsel for the applicant as to how applicant be permitted to withdraw application made by him in the pleadings.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that he does not want to press the amendment application, therefore, application be dismissed as withdrawn.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Accordingly, amendment application is dismissed as withdrawn.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 365 of 2021</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashok Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents No. 1 to 3 are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No notice to respondent No. 4 has been issued who is required to be heard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let notice be issued to him returnable within four weeks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Steps for notice be taken within a week.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 26.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 796 of 2021

Chandravati Devi W/o Late Ex. Hav. Girraj Kishore
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri D.S. Tiwari, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri R.C. Shukla and Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 29.08.2022.</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

O.A. No. 95 of 022

Ex. Rect. Ravindra Yadav
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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri R. Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Preeti Mala, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed, two weeks further time is granted to file counter affidavit, as a last chance.</p> <p>List on 06.07.2022.</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

O.A. No. 161 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Kapil 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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Ms. Upasna Mishra and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 162 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Mahesh 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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Amrita Chakraborty, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 163 of 2022

WEx. Sgt. Mohd. Maqsood Ahmed
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Manu Kumar 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. N. 165 of 2022

Ex.Sgt. Dhupesh Gupta
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajesh Shukla, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 166 of 2022

Ex. Sgt Manish Thakur
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Prerna Singh, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 193 of 2022

Ex. Hav. Hari Om Babu	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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As prayed, two weeks further time is granted to file counter affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 25.08.2022.</p> <p style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> (Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J) </p> <p>SB</p>

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

O.A. No. 195 of 2022

Smt. Bodhi Kumari W/o Ex. Sep Ilahi
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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Deepti Prasad Bajpai, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed, two weeks further time is granted to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>List on 25.08.2022.</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

O.A. No. 197 of 2022

Ex. Nb Sub Mahandra Pal By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant	Versus	Applicant
Union of India & Others By Legal Practitioner for Respondents		Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal		
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Virendra Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As prayed, two weeks further time is granted to file counter affidavit. List on 07.07.2022.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</td><td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</td></tr></table> <p>SB</p>	(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)	(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)
(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

T.A. No. 12 of 2021

Wg. Cdr. Gaurav Bhatnagar
By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner

Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing petitioner in person and Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Counter affidavit is not available on record. Registry is directed to trace the same and place it on record.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit filed by the petitioner is taken on record.</p> <p>List on 25.08.2022 for final hearing.</p> <p>On the date fixed, DPO-4 (Legal) of Air Headquarters shall remain present in the court to assist the Bench.</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

O.A. No. 259 of 2022

Ex. Sgt Amit
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. S.N. Pandey, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 260 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Gaurav Shukla
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Vishwesh Kumar, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 261 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Rajendra 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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No.262 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Adith 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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Anurag Mishra, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p>“5. <i>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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 263 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Prem 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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 264 of 2022

Sgt. Ashok Multangi
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 265 of 2022

Esg. Amit Kumar Gupta
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Gyan Singh, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No.266 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Ranjan Nautiyal
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Kavita Mishra, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 267 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Sanjay Kumar Pathak
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Shyam Singh, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 268 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Mithilesh 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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Devesh Kumar, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 269 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. S.K. 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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri R.C. Shukla, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 270 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Sirajuddin
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ram Saran Awasthi, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 272 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Rajesh Kumar Gupta
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajiv Pandey, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 273 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Chand Basha Syed
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Alok Kumar Mishra, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"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</i></p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 274 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Sukanta Kumar Sahoo
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

O.A. No. 275 of 2022

Ex. Sgt. Brij Mohan Singh Rawat
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>27.05.2022</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>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Manu Kumar 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 retired on 30.06.2021 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 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 discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</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 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:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“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</p>

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 applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, 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, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, 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)

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

Ex. A No. 11 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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri R. Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Brig Javed Iqbal, the applicant is also present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents, on the basis of instructions received, submits that in regard to compliance of order dated 07.01.2022 of this Tribunal passed in O.A. No 619 of 2021, Govt sanction for promotion and posting of the applicant has been accorded vide Additional Director General Personnel Services, Mil Secy Branch (Army), letter dated 20.05.2022. He further submits that, applicant could not be promoted and posted due to his file of promotion being not received from the office of competent authority at Army Headquarters, MoD. He further submits that file may be received in a day or two and thereafter order will be immediately implemented.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that implementation of order is being delayed by the respondents on one or the other reason.</p> <p>Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we direct the respondents to implement the order by 31 May 2022 and file affidavit of compliance on 02.06.2022 at Circuit Bench, Nainital failing which the Military Secretary, Integrated Headquarters of Min of Def, (Army) New Delhi shall remain present at Circuit Bench, Nainital to explain the reasons of non compliance.</p> <p>List on 02.06.2022 at Circuit Bench, Nainital.</p> <p>Copy of this order be provided to learned counsel for the parties within 48 hours.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

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

Ex. A No. 103 of 2022 along with O.A. No. 799 of 2021

Ex. Nk Satyendra Narayan Dubey
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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Col. A.K. Srivastava (Retd), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 25.07.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 265 of 2017

Smt. Soni 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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashok Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal , Shri Virendra Kumar Gupta and Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>List on 17.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 748 of 2020 along with O.A. 276 of 2017

Smt. Sushila Chauhan W/o Late Lt. Ranjit Singh Chauhan (Retd) 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>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh and Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 15.07.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

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

O.A. No. 155 of 2021

Nb Sub (RT) Pushkar Mishra
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>27.05.2022</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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashutosh Shahi and Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>List on 29.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

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

T.A. No. 98 of 2016 along with T.A. No. 99 of 2016(decided) and T.A. No. 48 of 2017

Smt. Laxmi Devi W/o Late Surendra Singh Saxena

Petitioner

By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner

Versus

The Commanding Officer, 658 Engr & Brigade Unit & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Bachchan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and Shri Anurag Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 30.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>

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

T.A. 48 of 2017 alongwith T.A. 98 of 2016 & T.A. 99 of 2018 (decided)

Unions of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants

Applicants-Respondents

Versus

Smt. Laxmi Devi W/o Late Surendra Singh Saxena

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondent-Applicant

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>27.05.2022</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 style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant-respondents and Shri Bachchan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents-applicants are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on 30.08.2022.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>