

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 1)

O.A. No. 495 of 2023

L/Nk Chandra Prakash & Others

Applicants

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants: Shri Satyendra K Tiwari, Advocate
Shri Santosh Singh, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Shyam Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Memo of appearance filed by Shri Shyam Singh, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. His name shall be shown in the cause list when the case is listed next.2. Heard Shri Shyam Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.3. Matter being related to seniority needs adjudication.4. Admit.5. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit to which learned counsel for the applicant may file rejoinder affidavit, if any, within two weeks next.6. List on 25.07.2023. <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 2)

O.A. No. 498 of 2023 with M.A. No. 596 of 2023

Ex Sep Balaji Tripathi

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Parijaat Belaura, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Memo of appearance filed by Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. His name shall be shown in the cause list when the case is listed next.</p> <p>2. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>3. As per office report, there is delay of 21 yrs, 02 months and 27 days in filing Original Application.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed two weeks time to file objection on application for condonation of delay.</p> <p>5. List on 14.07.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 3)

O.A. No. 504 of 2023

Ex Nb Sub Ramakant

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Dilip Pandey, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri RCShukla, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Memo of appearance filed by Shri RCShukla, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. His name shall be shown in the cause list when the case is listed next.2. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Dilip Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RCShukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.3. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed two weeks time to seek instructions and file affidavit with regard to recovery of amount.4. List on 24.05.2023. <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 4)

O.A. No. 517 of 2023 with M.A. No. 625 of 2023

Ex L/Nk Darshan Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Wg Cdr Ajit Kakkar (Retd), Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Rajesh Shukla , Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Memo of appearance filed by Shri Rajesh Shukla, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. His name shall be shown in the cause list when the case is listed next.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 625 of 2023</u></p> <p>2. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.</p> <p>3. As per office report, there is a delay of 01 year, 04 months and 11 days in filing original application.</p> <p>4. Heard Shri Rajesh Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application.</p> <p>5. Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that it is a pensionary matter in which bar of limitation is not applicable. His further submission is that delay in filing Original Application is not deliberate, but for the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of application.</p> <p>6. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents opposing the prayer submits that explanation of delay offered by the applicant is not sufficient and he has failed to offer day to day explanation of delay.</p> <p>7. Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering that in pensionary matters bar of limitation is not applicable and grounds stated in affidavit filed in support of delay condonation application are genuine and sufficient, delay is liable to be condoned.</p> <p>8. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No 517 of 2023</u></p> <p>9. Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p>10. Admit.</p> <p>11. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit. Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within next two weeks.</p> <p>12. List on 24.07.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 5)

EX-A No. 131 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 596 of 2018

Ex Sep Madappa Hasaraddi

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri R Chandra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. 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>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that mercy petition of the applicant has been disposed off and order under execution has been complied with.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the respondents is directed to file affidavit of compliance within two weeks.</p> <p>4. List on 31.05.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 6)

EX- A. No. 151 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 666 of 2017

Ex Nk (Reservist) Awadh Narain

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Col AK Srivastava (Retd), Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that order under execution has been complied with and payment has been made.</p> <p>3. Today learned counsel for the applicant is not present. Vide order dated 18.03.2023 learned counsel for the applicant was directed to take steps for impleadment of PDA (bank) but no step has been taken. He is directed to take steps for impleadment of PDA within four weeks.</p> <p>4. List on 27.07.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 7)

EX- A. No. 268 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 231 of 2018

Bhupendar Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Sunil Sharma, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Affidavit of compliance has not been filed.</p> <p>3. Three weeks further time is granted to learned counsel for the respondents to file affidavit of compliance failing which officer responsible for non implementation of order shall be present before the Tribunal to clarify the reasons for non compliance of the order.</p> <p>4. List on 03.07.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 8)

O.A. No. 945 of 2022

Ex Sep Ravi Kumar Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Rajeev Narayan Pandey, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajeev Narayan Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record. Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within four weeks.</p> <p>3. List on 01.08.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 9)

O.A. No. 946 of 2022

Ex Sep Ram Autar Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Jitendra Bahadur Singh, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Sunil Sharma, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Jitendra Bahadur Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit has not been filed. Departmental representative for the respondents submits that parawise comments are awaited. He prays for and is granted four weeks further time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>3. List on 02.06.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 10)

O.A. No. 962 of 2022

Brij Mohan Singh S/o Late L/Nk Sat Narain Singh
(Through Shri Bishram Singh Legal Guardian) Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that counter affidavit has been prepared and sent for vetting. He prays for and is granted four weeks further time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>3. List on 02.06.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 11)

O.A. No. 1024 of 2022

Ex Sub Maj (Hony Lt) Vinod Kumar Upadhaya Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri KP Datta, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri KP Datta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that counter affidavit is under preparation. He prays for and is allowed two weeks time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>3. List on 30.05.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 12)

O.A. No. 165 of 2023

Ex Sub Ravi Sharan Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant is present.</p> <p>2. As prayed by learned counsel for the respondents four weeks further time is allowed to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>3. List on 01.08.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 13)

O.A. No. 203 of 2023

Ex Sub Padmaker Prasad Pandey

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Ms.Upasna Mishra, Advocate
Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate
Shri Satya Narayan Mishra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri R C Shukla, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.2. Heard Ms. Upasna Mishra, Shri Raj Kumar Mishra and Shri Satya Narayan Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.3. 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 30.06.1994 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.1994 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).4. 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. 30.06.2020 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2020. 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.5. 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 style="text-align: center;">“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</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.”

6. 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 30.06.2020, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2020, on which date he was not in service, he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

7. 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 01.07.2019 to 30.06.2020, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2020, 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

8. Let a copy of this order be provided to the learned Counsel for the parties.

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

rathore

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 14)

O.A. No. 269 of 2023 with M.A. No. 282 of 2023

Ex Sub Birendra Partap Tripathi Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri RC Shukla, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Vinay Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted two weeks and no more time to file objection on application for condonation of delay.</p> <p>3. In order dated 28.03.2023 name of Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Advocate was wrongly typed in place of Shri RC Shukla, Advocate. The same is corrected to read as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Advocate Read Shri RC Shukla, Advocate</p> <p>4. List on 20.07.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 15)

O.A. No. 355 of 2023

Sgt Ramlakhan Kumar (Retd)

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Kapil Sharma, Advocate
Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate
Ms.Upasna Mishra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Satya Narayan Mishra, Advocate holding brief for Shri Kapil Sharma, Shri Raj Kumar Mishra and Ms.Upasna Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit has not been filed. Let it be filed within three days.</p> <p>3. List on 23.05.2023.</p> <p>4. In order dated 28.03.2023 name of Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Advocate was wrongly typed in place of Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate. The same is corrected to read as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Advocate Read Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 16)

M.A. No. 408 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 358 of 2022

Smt Ram Maya Ghale W/o Late Ex Nk Dambar Bahadur Ghale Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Veer Raghav Chaubey, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Veer Raghav Chaubey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Amendment has not been incorporated in O.A. Learned counsel for the applicant is directed to incorporate the amendment during course of the day.</p> <p>3. List on 01.08.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 17)

O.A. No. 585 of 2022

Capt (IN) Kamlesh Kumar Varma (Retd) Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Abhishek R Shukla, Advocate
Shri Ashish Asthana, Advocate
Shri Dharam Raj Singh, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Amit Jaiswal, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>03.05.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Abhishek R Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that there were similarly situated Group Captain of IAF who had retired before the date of implementation as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and were given the benefit of the above case.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the applicant is permitted to bring on record his statement in respect of the above by way of affidavit.</p> <p>4. List on 21.07.2023 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>