

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

DY. No. 2474 of 2022

Hav Roby Kunjumon 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 RC Shukla, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>None appeared on behalf of the applicant.</p> <p>Defects pointed out by the Registry have not been removed. Since Ld. Counsel for the applicant is not present before the Court, last opportunity is given to remove the defects by the date fixed failing which the case shall be dismissed for want of prosecution.</p> <p>List on 01.05.2023.</p> <p>(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p>(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)

EX-A. No. 91 of 2021 with M.A. No. 328 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 628 of 2020

Smt Asha Devi,
(M/o Late Ex Sigmn Kapil Kumar) & another Applicants
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants: Shri Pushpendra Kumar Dhaka, Advocate
Shri Rama Kant, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Puspendra Mishra, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Pushpendra Kumar Dhaka and Shri Rama Kant, Ld. Counsel for the applicants and Shri Puspendra Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Cost imposed on the respondents has not been paid.</p> <p>Affidavit of compliance has not been filed.</p> <p>In case on the next date fixed, affidavit of compliance is not filed, the authority responsible for execution of order shall remain present before this Tribunal.</p> <p>List on 01.05.2023.</p> <p>(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. 3)

EX-A. No. 89 of 2022 Inre T.A. No. 1283 of 2010

Ex Sep Inderjeet Kumar Petitioner
By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner: Shri Manish Kumar Rai, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Objection on compliance report filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted two weeks time to file replication.</p> <p>List on 01.05.2023.</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. 4)

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

Ex Sep Madappa Hasaraddi

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: 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>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, 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>Ld. Counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 03.05.2023.</p> <p>(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p>(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. 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>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>On 30.11.2022 applicant was directed to take steps for impleadment of PDA (Bank) but no steps have been taken.</p> <p>Applicant is directed to take steps to implead PDA within four weeks.</p> <p>List on 03.05.2023.</p> <p>(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. 6)

O.A. No. 861 of 2021

Ex Hony Nb Sub Anil Kumar Dubey Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Mohd Zafar Khan, 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>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed within two weeks.</p> <p>List on 24.04.2023.</p> <p>(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p>(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)

O.A. No. 455 of 2022

Ex Sub Maj (Hony Capt) Ram Krishna Pandey Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manoj Kumar Srivastava, 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>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit has not been filed.</p> <p>Today learned counsel for the applicant is not present, therefore, last opportunity of four weeks time is granted to file rejoinder affidavit.</p> <p>List on 24.04.2023.</p> <p>(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p>(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. 636 of 2022

Ex Sgt Dhananjay Singh Janoti Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Advocate
Shri Kapil Sharma, Advocate
Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Mrs Kavita Mishra, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Heard Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs Kavita Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit filed by learned counsel for the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>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 enrolled on 20.06.2001 and 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) and this Tribunal judgment in OA 366 of 2020, <i>Ex HFL Sarvesh Kumar vs. Union of India & Ors</i>, decided on 12.08.2021.</p> <p>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. 31.06.2021 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>5. The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble Madras 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>

“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 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 30.06.2021, 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.

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 01.07.2020 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, after verifying documents. 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)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

rathore

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 9)
O.A. No. 637 of 2022

MWO (HFO) Lal Chand Yadav (Retd)
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant:

Applicant
Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Advocate
Shri Kapil Sharma, Advocate
Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents:

Respondents
Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Heard Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit filed by learned counsel for the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>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 enrolled on 18.03.1980 and retired on 30.06.2020 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2020 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) and this Tribunal judgment in OA 366 of 2020, <i>Ex HFL Sarvesh Kumar vs. Union of India & Ors</i>, decided on 12.08.2021.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5. The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble Madras 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</p>

Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-

“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 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, after verifying documents. 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)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

rathore

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.2 (Sl. No. 10)
O.A. No. 641 of 2022

Ex Sgt Digvijay Singh Sisodia

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant:

Applicant
Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Advocate
Shri Kapil Sharma, Advocate
Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents:

Respondents
Shri Rajeev Narayan Pandey, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Heard Shri Bipin Kumar Sharma, Shri Kapil Sharma and Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajeev Narayan Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit filed by learned counsel for the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>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 enrolled on 20.06.2001 and 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) and this Tribunal judgment in OA 366 of 2020, <i>Ex HFL Sarvesh Kumar vs. Union of India & Ors</i>, decided on 12.08.2021.</p> <p>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. 30.06.2021 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>5. The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble Madras 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</p>

Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-

“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 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 30.06.2021, 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.

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 01.07.2020 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, after verifying documents. 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)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

rathore

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

O.A. No. 733 of 2022

Ex Sgt Suryakant Srivastava 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 Amit Jaiswal, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>On call of the case no one appeared on behalf of the applicant.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit may be filed within two weeks.</p> <p>List on 25.04.2023.</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. 12)

O.A. No. 787 of 2022 with M.A. No. 977 of 2022

Maj J Belwal Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Parijaat Belaura, 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>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Parijaat Belaura, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed by Ld. Counsel for the applicant, two weeks time is granted to file reply to objection on delay condonation application.</p> <p>List on 25.04.2023.</p> <p>(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. 13)

O.A. No. 811 of 2022 with M.A. No. 1007 of 2022

Smt Ratnamani Sahu,
M/o Late Cfn Durga Charan Sau & another Applicants
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants: Shri Anurag Shukla, Advocate
Shri Dharam Raj Singh, Advocate
Shri Karunanidhi Yadav, Advocate
Ms. Gitanjali Nayak, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>Vide order dated 01.11.2022, applicant was directed to take steps for impleadment of deceased soldier's wife which the applicant has not taken.</p> <p>In view of the above, Ld. Counsel for the applicant is granted two weeks time, as last opportunity, to implead the deceased soldier's wife and file affidavit in support thereof.</p> <p>List on 04.05.2023.</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. 14)

O.A. No. 261 of 2020

Ram Nath Mishra Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Yashpal 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>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>On request of Ld. Counsel for applicant, the case is adjourned.</p> <p>List on 19.04.2023.</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. 15)

O.A. No. 626 of 2020

Hariom Singh, S/o Late Ex Sep Kedar Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Veer Raghav Chaubey, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Veer Raghav Chauhey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Ld. counsel for the applicant prays for and is granted two weeks time to file supplementary affidavit along with legible copy of annexure filed in support of affidavit.</p> <p>List on 13.04.2023.</p> <p>(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)

O.A. No. 772 of 2020

Milton Singh Tomar

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri R Chandra, 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>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri R Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents. Arguments concluded. Order is reserved.</p> <p>(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. 17)

O.A. No. 386 of 2021

Cpl Chandan Yadav Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ram Bachan Yadav, Advocate
Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Kaushik Chatterjee, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Rahul, Advocate holding brief for Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Kaushik Chatterjee, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Brief holder Shri Rahul, Advocate submits that Shri Ravi Kumar Yadv, learned counsel for the applicant is ill and unable to attend the court. He prays for adjournment of the case.</p> <p>As prayed, the case is passed over for the day.</p> <p>List on 04.05.2023.</p> <p>(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. 18)

O.A. No. 104 of 2022

Pnr Rohit Kumar

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Virat Anand Singh, Advocate
Shri Anugrah Narayan, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Virat Anand Singh and Shri Anugrah Narayan, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Supplementary affidavit filed by learned counsel for the applicant is taken on record.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted two weeks time to file reply.</p> <p>List on 13.04.2023.</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. 19)

O.A. No. 593 of 2022

Ex JWO Rakesh Kumar Sachdeva Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Rang Nath Pandey, Advocate
Shri Rahul Pandey, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard Shri Rang Nath Pandey and Shri Rahul Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Arguments heard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Judgment is reserved.</p> <p>(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. 20)

T.A. No. 80 of 2016

Anoop Kumar Petitioner
By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner: Shri Yashpal Singh, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner and Shri DK Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Subject matter pertains to GCM.</p> <p>List before the appropriate Bench as per roster on 28.03.2023.</p> <p>(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. 21)

T.A. No. 4 of 2022

Lagnesh Mishra

Petitioner

By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner: Shri Rang Nath Pandey, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri DK Pandey, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Rang Nath Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner and Shri DK Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>On request of learned counsel for the parties list on 17.04.2023 for filing written points of arguments alongwith supported case laws.</p> <p>(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p>(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>