































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

Ex. A. No 35 of 2019 Inre T.A. No 349 of 2010

**Ex Nk (TS) Ramayan Mishra**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

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

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>09.12.2020</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashish Kumar Singh and Shri Virat Anand Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Anurag Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned counsel for the respondents submits that order under execution has been complied with. He prays for and is granted two weeks time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">List on <b>21.01.2021</b> for orders.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b> Member (A)                      <b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> Member (J)</p> <p>UKT/-</p>









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

**M.A. No. 114 of 2019 with M.A. No. 115 of 2019**  
**Inre EX-A/114 of 2018 Inre O.A. No. 245 of 2015**

**Ajay Kumar Tiwari**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

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

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><b><u>09.12.2020</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>Heard Col AK Srivastava (Retd), learned counsel for the applicant and Shri GS Sikarwar, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>M.A. No. 114 of 2019 with M.A. No. 115 of 2019</u></b></p> <p>Being satisfied with reasons given in affidavit, we allow both the applications i.e. delay condonation application and recall application.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>EX-A/114 of 2018</u></b></p> <p>By order dated 11.07.2018 passed by this Tribunal, respondents were directed to submit an affidavit stating therein the details of orders issued to units to re-instate the applicant alongwith copy of letters. Applicant was also directed to furnish name(s) of officer/officers who did not permit him to join the duty. The said order has not been complied with by the parties..</p> <p>Now it is submitted by learned counsel for the respondents that since applicant did not resume the duty despite being directed in this regard several times, he has been dismissed from service again.</p> <p>Therefore, both the applicant as well as respondents are directed to make compliance of the order within four weeks positively failing which matter would be seriously viewed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>O.A. No. 245 of 2015</u></b></p> <p>List on <b>28.01.2021</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)</b> Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)</b> Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>





































































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

**O.A. No. 42 of 2019**

**Ex Hav Jaya Nand Upadhyay**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

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

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>09.12.2020</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. Heard Shri Parijaat Belaura, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri R.C. Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. The instant Original Application has been filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 by means of which applicant has prayed that respondents be directed to condone deficiency in minimum qualifying service for grant of second service pension of Defence Security Corps (DSC) and to grant second service pension to applicant from the date of discharge i.e. 31.01.2007.</p> <p>3. Briefly stated facts are that applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 10.10.1969 and after rendering 20 years and 356 days of service he was discharged from service w.e.f. 30.09.1990 (AN) for which he is in receipt of service pension. He was re-employed in Defence Security Corps (DSC) on 14.01.1992 and after completing 14 years and 352 days of service discharged from service on 31.12.2006 (AN) at the age of 57 years. As per rule, 15 years of minimum service is required for second service pension, but as there was deficiency of 13 days in qualifying service, applicant was not granted second service pension of DSC. Applicant has preferred the present O.A. for condoning the short fall in service for grant of second service pension for his services rendered in Defence Security Corps.</p> <p>4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that as per Rule 125 of Pension Regulations for the Army 1961 condonation of service up to six months is allowed. However, there being a shortfall of 13 days in the case of applicant, shortfall was not condoned in view of Govt of India, Ministry of Defence letter dated 14.08.2001. Learned counsel for the applicant also relied upon Judgment of Armed Forces Tribunal (RB) Chandigarh in O.A. No. 333 of 2015 <b><i>Uday Singh vs. Union of India &amp; Others</i></b> decided on 31.05.2016 and <b><i>Union of India and another vs. Surender Singh Parmar</i></b> in Civil Appeal No.</p>

9389 of 2014 decided on 20.01.2015.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that Para 173 of Defence Service Regulations Part - I, 2008, clearly says that grant of pensionary award to personnel of DSC shall be governed by the same Regulations as are applicable to personnel below officers' rank in the army except where they are inconsistent with the provisions of Regulations. Thus, he submits that Government of India, Ministry of Defence, letter dated 14.08.2001 being equally applicable in case of applicant also, deficiency of 13 days in minimum qualifying service is liable to be condoned and applicant is entitled to second service pension.

6. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents has vehemently opposed and submitted that applicant on attaining the age of 57 years was discharged from DSC service wef 31.12.2006 under the provisions of Army Rule 13 (3) item III (i) after rendering 14 years and 352 days qualifying service for which he was paid Service gratuity and retirement gratuity. Applicant is deficient of 13 days for grant of second service pension. He submitted that in terms of Para 47 of Pension Regulations for the Army 2008 (Part-1), 'unless otherwise provided for, the minimum qualifying service for earning a service pension is 15 years'. In the instant case, the applicant had rendered only 14 years and 352 days qualifying service in DSC. Hence, he is not entitled for grant of second service pension for the service rendered by him in DSC. His case cannot be considered for condonation of deficiency in qualifying service for grant of second pension in terms of Govt of India, Ministry of Defence letter no. 14(2)/2011/D(Pen/Pol) dated 23 April 2012 and letter No. 14(2)/2011/D (Pen/Pol) dated 20.06.2017, as he is already in receipt of one service pension for the former service rendered by him in the Army. The intention behind condonation of service for grant of service pension being based on the policy that individual must not be left high and dry but should be eligible for at least one service pension and the same being not applicable for the second service pension in respect of DSC, Government of India has issued letter dated 20.06.2017 and clarified that 'no condonation shall be allowed for grant of second service pension'. Keeping in view this letter and also that there is deficiency of 13 days in qualifying service, as such, applicant is not entitled to second service pension.

7. Having heard the submissions of learned counsel both sides and having gone through Rule 125 of Pension Regulations Part I, Rules 2008 as well as Govt. of India, Ministry of Defence letter dated 14.08.2001, Government of India, Ministry of Defence letter No. 14 (2)/2011/D (Pen) dated 23.04.2012 and letter No 14 (02)/2011 (Pen) dated 20.06.2017, we find that issue regarding condonation of deficiency in minimum qualifying service regarding second service pension of DSC being cropped up in many cases has been dealt with not only by different Benches of the Armed Forces Tribunal but also by the

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Shiv Dass vs Union of India and Others*** in Civil Appeal No 274 of 2007, decided on 18.01.2007, and it has been held therein that deficiency in qualifying service upto 1 year is condonable. Taking note of the above and also that there is deficiency of only 13 days in qualifying service of the applicant and the said deficiency is condonable under Rule 125 of the Army Rules 2008, we find that applicant's claim regarding condonation in deficiency in qualifying service for the grant of second service pension has wrongly been rejected by the respondents.

8. Accordingly, O.A. is allowed. The shortfall of 13 days in minimum qualifying service of the applicant in getting second service pension is condoned. Applicant is held entitled to get second service pension in DSC as well in addition to pension which he is already getting from the Army.

9. The respondents are directed to grant second service pension to the applicant from the date on which applicant completes 15 years after discharge from DSC service i.e. 13.01.2007. They are further directed to implement this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Delay shall invite interest @ 9% per annum till actual payment.

10. No order as to costs.

**(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)**  
Member (A)

**(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)**  
Member (J)

SB





























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

**O.A. No. 63 of 2020**

**Ex Nk Balam Singh**  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

**Versus**

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

Respondents

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>09.12.2020</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. Heard Shri Sudhir Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. The instant Original Application has been filed on behalf of the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, whereby the applicant has sought following reliefs:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“(I) To quash the impugned order dated 09.04.2013, after summoning the same from the respondents, by which the disability pension of the applicant have been rejected.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(II) To quash the impugned order dated 24.05.2014, which is annexed as Annexure No. 4 to this original application, by which the disability pension of the applicant have been rejected.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(III) To pass an order or direction commanding the respondents to grant the disability pension to the applicant from the date of discharge i.e. 31.01.2013.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(IV) To pass an order or direction commanding the respondent to grant the benefits disability pension to the applicant from the date of discharge i.e. 31.01.2013 along with interest @ 18% per annum till the actual realization of aforesaid amount.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(v) To pass an order or direction commanding the respondent to grant the benefits of rounding of the disability pension up to the tune of 50% in term of Govt. of India letter dated 31.01.2001 and various Judgment of Apex Court as well as this Hon'ble Tribunal.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(VI) Pass any order which this Hon'ble Tribunal deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the case in favour of the petitioner, in the interest of justice.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(VII) Allow the Original Application with cost.”</p> <p>3. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the applicant was initially enrolled in the Indian Army on 03.12.1979 and was discharged from service on</p>

31.12.1995 (AN) after rendering 16 years and 29 days of qualifying service for which he is in receipt of service pension. Thereafter, applicant was enrolled in DSC on 21.01.1998 and was discharged from service on 31.01.2013 (AN) after rendering 15 years and 11 days of service in low medical category for which he is in receipt of second service pension. The Release Medical Board (RMB) assessed his disability "PRIMARY HYPERTENSION" @ 30% for life. However, the RMB opined that the disability of the applicant was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service (NANA) and onset of the disease was in peace station. The applicant's claim for grant of disability pension was not granted by the respondents vide order dated 09.04.2013. His first and second appeals were also rejected vide order dated 24.04.2014 and 27.07.2015 respectively. Hence the instant Original Application has been filed.

4. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant was medically fit when he was enrolled in the service and any disability not recorded at the time of enrolment should be presumed to have been caused subsequently. The action of the respondents in not granting disability pension to the applicant is illegal. In this regard, he relied on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Dharamvir Singh v. Union of India and others***, (2013) 7 SCC 316 and submitted that for the purpose of determining attributability of the disease to military service, what is material is whether the disability was detected during the initial pre-commissioning medical tests and if no disability was detected at that time, then it is to be presumed that the disability arose while in service, therefore, the disability of the applicant is to be considered as aggravated by service and he is entitled to get disability pension @ 30% for life and the same is to be broad banded to 50%.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents has filed the Counter Affidavit and submitted that though the RMB has assessed the disability of the applicant @ 30% for life, it has opined that the disability is NANA and onset of the disability was in peace area. As such, his claim for disability pension has rightly been rejected by the respondents. He submitted that the instant Original Application does not have any merit and the same is to be dismissed.

6. We have heard submissions of both the parties and also gone through the Release Medical Board proceedings as well as the records. The question which needs to be answered is whether the disability of the applicant is attributable to or aggravated by Military Service?

7. After going through counter affidavit and the opinion of the specialist medical officer, we have noted that for the disability of the applicant "**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION**", the only reason for declaring the disease as NANA is that it has originated in peace area and has no close time association with Fd/CI Ops/HAA tenure. However, on further scrutiny, we have observed that this disability was detected in July, 2010, i.e. after 12 years of service in DSC. We are, therefore, of the considered opinion that the reasons given in RMB for declaring disease as NANA is very brief and cryptic in nature and do not adequately explain the denial of attributability. We don't agree with the view that there is no stress and strain of service in military stations located in peace areas. Hence, we are inclined to give benefit of doubt in favour of the applicant. Thus, we are of the considered opinion that disability "Primary Hypertension" @ 30% is to be considered as aggravated by military service because stress and strain of military service in line with the law settled on this matter by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Dharamvir Singh* (supra).

8. The applicant will also be eligible for the benefit of rounding off of his disability from 30% to 50% for life in terms of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Union of India and others v. Ram Avtar* (Civil Appeal No 418 of 2012 dated 10.12.2014).

9. Resultantly, the Original Application is allowed. The impugned orders are set aside. The applicant's disability "**Primary Hypertension**" @ 30% for life, is to be considered as aggravated by military service and his disability element of pension is to be rounded off from 30% to 50% for life from the date of his discharge from DSC i.e.31.01.2013. However, due to law of limitations settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Shiv Dass v. Union of India and others* (2007 (3) SLR 445), the arrear of disability element will be restricted to three years preceding the date of filing of the instant O.A. The date

of filing of this O.A is 13.12.2019. The respondents are directed to give effect to this order within four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till actual payment.

10. No order as to costs.

**(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)**  
Member (A)

**(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)**  
Member (J)

SB