

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

O.A. No. 460 of 2023 with M.A. No. 554 of 2023

Smt Manju Devi W/o Late Nk Balwant Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri R Chandra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Mrs Anju Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Mrs Anju Singh, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. Her name shall be shown in the cause list when the case is listed next.2. There is delay of 12 years, 05 months and 02 days in filing Original Application for which delay condonation application has been filed by learned counsel for the applicant.3. Heard Shri R Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application.4. Learned counsel for the respondents seeks and is allowed two weeks time to file objection on delay condonation application.5. List on 25.05.2023. <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. 2)

O.A. No. 461 of 2023 with M.A. No. 555 of 2023

Ex JWO Sunil Kumar Gupta

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Kapil Sharma, Advocate, Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate and Ms. Upasna Mishra. 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>21.04.2023</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 RC 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. 555 of 20232.</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 05 yrs and 04 months filing original application.</p> <p>4. Heard Shri Kapil Sharma, Shri Raj Kumar Mishra and Ms. Upasna Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</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. 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 461 of 2023</u></p> <p>Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p>Admit.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>List on 19.07.2023.</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. 3)

EX- A. No. 93 of 2023 with M.A. No. 835 of 2021

Ex Sep Raj Nath Tiwari Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Shashwat Shukla, Advocate

Versus

The Record Officer, AMC & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Mrs. Deepti Prasad Bajpai, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Mrs Deepti Prasad Bajpai, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. Her name shall be shown in the cause list when the case is listed next.2. On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Shashwat Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs Deepti Prasad Bajpai, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.3. This execution application has been filed for implementation of order dated 21.01.2022 passed in O.A. No. 835 of 2021.4. This is a fresh execution application.5. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks time to seek instructions and file affidavit of compliance.6. List on 21.07.2023. <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. 4)

M. A. No. 552 of 2023 with M.A. No. 553 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 820 of 2022

Union of India & Others Applicants-respondents
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants: Shri RC Shukla, Advocate

Versus

Ex Hav (ACP Nb Sub) Gitam Singh Respondent
By Legal Practitioner for Respondent: Shri....., Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p><u>M.A. No. 552 of 2023</u></p> <p>1. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing application for leave to appeal.</p> <p>2. There is delay of 02 months and 10 days in filing leave to appeal.</p> <p>3. Submission of learned counsel for the applicants-Union of India & Others is that delay in filing leave to appeal is not deliberate. His further submission is that after passing of the order dated 06.02.2023 correspondences were made with different agencies which caused delay in filing LTA. Thus, his submission is that delay is not deliberate, but for the reasons mentioned above and time taken by the department in processing the case for filing of the present application, delay of 02 months and 10 days is condonable in filing application for leave to appeal.</p> <p>4. We have gone through the affidavit filed in support of delay condonation application and find that the grounds and reasons shown in the accompanying affidavit for condonation of delay seem sufficient and therefore, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands disposed off.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 553 of 2023</u></p> <p>5. This application has been filed under Section 30 read with Section 31 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 against the judgment and order dated 06.02.2023 of this Tribunal passed in Original Application No 820 of 2022.</p> <p>6. After perusing the order impugned, we find that no much or less point of law of general public importance involved for grant of leave to appeal.</p> <p>7. Accordingly, leave to appeal is dismissed.</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)

T. A. No. 23 of 2023

Munni Lal Alias Munne Lal

Petitioner

By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner: Shri, 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>21.04.2023</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 Ashish 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.2. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.3. This case has been received on transfer from Hon'ble High Court Allahabad. Today none is present on behalf of the petitioner.4. Let notice be issued to the petitioner returnable within four weeks.5. List on 19.07.2023. <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. 6)

EX- A. No. 111 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 38 of 2021

Swamy Nath, S/o Late Ex Nk Bagedu Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri R Chandra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Manu Kumar Srivastava, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 is present.</p> <p>2. Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Advocate submitted that Shri Manu Kumar Srivastava, learned counsel for the respondents is not well.</p> <p>3. Affidavit of compliance has not been filed. Captain Priyanka Rathore, Departmental Representative for the respondents prays for and is granted two week further time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>4. List on 18.05.2023.</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. 7)

EX- A. No. 185 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 653 of 2020

Ex Flt Cadet Charul Verma

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Parijaat Belaura, 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>21.04.2023</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. On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Shyam Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that SLP in this case has been filed in the Hon'ble Supreme Court.3. He prays for and is granted two weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance else additional cost shall be imposed.4. Let cost imposed earlier be deposited by the next date fixed.5. List on 25.05.2023. <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. 8)

O.A. No. 521 of 2021

Ex AC(U/T) Aditya Kashyap

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate
Shri JBS Rathour, 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>21.04.2023</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. Heard Shri Vinay Pandey and Shri JBS Rathour, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.2. Rejoinder affidavit filed by learned counsel for the applicant is taken on record.3. Pleadings are complete and the case is ripe for hearing.4. List on 21.07.2023 for hearing. <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. 9)

O.A. No. 95 of 2022

Ex Rect Ravindra Yadav

Applicant

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

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Ms. Preeti Mala, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Ms. Preeti Mala, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Despite granting sufficient opportunities, rejoinder affidavit has not been filed, therefore, opportunity to file rejoinder affidavit is closed.</p> <p>3. List on 21.07.2023 for 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>

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

O.A. No. 193 of 2022 with M.A. No. 1332 of 2022

Ex Hav Hari Om Babu Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Mohd Zafar Khan, advocate on behalf of respondent No 5 and 6 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 Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondent No 1 to 4 and Mohd Zafar Khan, learned counsel for the respondent No 5 and 6 are present.</p> <p>3. As prayed by learned counsel for the respondent No 5 and 6, two weeks time is granted to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>4. List on 25.05.2023.</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. 11)

O.A. No. 232 of 2022

Ex Hav Jai Prakash Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate
Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Ram Saran Awasthi, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ram Saran Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. Arguments concluded.</p> <p>3. Order is reserved.</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. 832 of 2022

Ex Swr Prayag Datt Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Virat Anand 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>19.04.2023</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 Virat Anand Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit filed by learned counsel for the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>3. Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks.</p> <p>4. 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. 13)

O.A. No. 80 of 2023

Ex Rect Pravin Kumar

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Rohit Kumar, Advocate

Versus

Chief of Army Staff & Others

Respondents

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Rohit Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. This O.A. has been moved by the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 with prayer to direct the respondents to dispose off the statutory complaint of the applicant.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the respondents has raised objection on maintainability of this O.A. He has moved application against maintainability of this O.A. in which it is submitted that application is not maintainable for want of territorial jurisdiction and statutory complaint made by the applicant is not in accordance with Regulation 368 of Regulations for the Army, 1987.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that objection raised on maintainability is evasive, misleading and vague.</p> <p>5. We have considered submission made by learned counsel for the parties and perused O.A., objection of the respondents, reply to objection moved by the applicant.</p> <p>6. Presently applicant is not in service and in O.A. it is mentioned that he is resident of District Fatehpur (UP). As provided under Rule 6 of Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 this O.A. is in the territorial jurisdiction of this Tribunal. As regards second objection it is submitted that statutory complaint is not in accordance with Regulation 368 of Regulations for the Army, 1987 but it is not maintainable.</p> <p>7. The respondents are required to dispose off the statutory complaint of the applicant in accordance with law.</p> <p>8. Thus, this is a fit case for intervention of this Tribunal and objection</p>

raised on maintainability is over ruled.

9. Points raised in this O.A. are considerable. Matter needs adjudication.

10. Admit.

11. Counter affidavit be filed by learned counsel for the respondents within four weeks to which learned counsel for the applicant may file rejoinder affidavit, if any, within next two weeks.

12. List on **06.07.2023**.

(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. 81 of 2023 with M.A. No. 71 of 2023

Ex Nk Rajiv Giri

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Rohit Kumar, 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>21.04.2023</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 Rohit Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. This O.A. has been filed by the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the respondents has raised preliminary objection which has been filed in the form of affidavit. It is submitted by learned counsel for the respondents that applicant has prayed in O.A. to direct the respondents to dispose off the statutory complaint preferred by the applicant dated 14.04.2022. Statutory complaint is governed under the provisions of Section 26 of the Army Act, 1950 and said provision is applicable with respect to persons subject to Army Act. It is submitted that in the instant case the applicant has preferred the statutory complaint after his discharge order was issued, therefore, statutory complaint is not tenable. It is also submitted that as provided in Para 368 of Regulations for the Army, 1987 ex-soldier can prefer petition which is required to be addressed to Commanding Officer of the last unit but in this case statutory complaint has been addressed to Chief of the Army Staff.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that objection raised by the respondents is vague, evasive and misleading.</p> <p>5. We have considered submission made by learned counsel for the parties and perused O.A., objection on maintainability and reply of the applicant against objection.</p> <p>6. In this O.A. applicant has sought relief for quashing the premature discharge, re-instatement into service and also for directions to dispose of his</p>

statutory complaint dated 14.04.2022. The statutory complaint under Section 26 of the Army Act, 1950 dated 14.04.2022 should have been decided by the concerned authorities within six months in terms of Section 21 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 which has not been done by the authorities for that he has moved this application. Respondents are directed to dispose off the statutory complaint of the applicant in accordance with law.

7. Considering the above points we are of the considered view that it is a fit case for intervention by this Tribunal and objection raised on maintainability are liable to be overruled. Accordingly, objection raised by the respondents on maintainability of this O.A. is over ruled.

M.A. No. 71 of 2023

8. Heard learned counsel for the parties on admission of this O.A. as well as condonation of delay.

9. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.

10. As per office report, there is a delay of 04 months and 11 days filing original application.

11. Heard Shri Kapil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.

O.A. No 81 of 2023

16. Considerable points are raised by the applicant in O.A. Matter needs adjudication.

17. Admit.

18. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit.

19. List on **06.07.2023**.

(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. 15)

O.A. No. 119 of 2023 with M.A. No. 116 of 2023

Ex Spr Rajesh Kumar Singh

Applicant

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

Shri Rakesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Ms. Deepti P Bajpai, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Mrs Deepti Prasad Bajpai, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. Her 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 VP Pandey and Shri Rakesh Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Deepti P Bajpai, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that annexure filed with the O.A. is not legible. She prays for to provide legible copy of the same so that counter affidavit could be filed.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the applicant shall file legible copy of annexure within four weeks.</p> <p>5. List on 06.07.2023.</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. 16)

O.A. No. 191 of 2023

Ex POME Bipin Kumar Varnwal Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manish Kumar Rai, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajiv Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that similar matter is pending before the AFT, Principal Bench.</p> <p>3. We find that in this case CGDA seems to be necessary party. Learned counsel for the applicant is directed to implead CGDA as respondents.</p> <p>4. List on 18.07.2023.</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. 17)

O.A. No. 192 of 2023

Ex POELR Pramod Kumar Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manish Kumar Rai, 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>21.04.2023</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 Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that similar matter is pending before the AFT, Principal Bench.</p> <p>3. We find that in this case CGDA seems to be necessary party. Learned counsel for the applicant is directed to implead CGDA as respondents.</p> <p>4. List on 18.07.2023.</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. 18)

O.A. No. 194 of 2023

Ex POME Khusheel Kumar Sharma Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manish Kumar Rai, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that similar matter is pending before the AFT, Principal Bench.</p> <p>3. We find that in this case CGDA seems to be necessary party. Learned counsel for the applicant is directed to implead CGDA as respondents.</p> <p>4. List on 18.07.2023.</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. 19)

O.A. No. 195 of 2023

Ex PORTAC Nandlal Singh Yadav Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manish Kumar Rai, 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>21.04.2023</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 Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Chet Narayan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that similar matter is pending before the AFT, Principal Bench.</p> <p>3. We find that in this case CGDA seems to be necessary party. Learned counsel for the applicant is directed to implead CGDA as respondents.</p> <p>4. List on 18.07.2023.</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. 20)

O.A. No. 196 of 2023

Ex CPO COM (EW) Vinod Kumar Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manish Kumar Rai, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Ms. Anju Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that similar matter is pending before the AFT, Principal Bench.</p> <p>3. We find that in this case CGDA seems to be necessary party. Learned counsel for the applicant is directed to implead CGDA as respondents.</p> <p>4. List on 18.07.2023.</p> <p>5. Mrs Anju Singh, Advocate has moved an application dated 06.04.2023 stating that she is counsel for the respondents in this case but due to oversight her name was not typed in order dated 28.02.2023, instead name of Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate was typed.</p> <p>6. On perusal we find that Mrs Anju Singh, Advocate is counsel on behalf of the respondents in this case but due to typographical error name of Dr. Chet Narayan Singh was wrongly typed in order dated 28.02.2023.</p> <p>7. In view of the above order dated 28.02.2023 is corrected to read as under:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For : Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate Read : Mrs Anju Singh, Advocate</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. 21)

O.A. No. 236 of 2023

Ex POME Raman Sahu Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manish Kumar Rai, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Manish Kumar Rai, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri JN Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that similar matter is pending before the AFT, Principal Bench.</p> <p>3. We find that in this case CGDA seems to be necessary party. Learned counsel for the applicant is directed to implead CGDA as respondents.</p> <p>4. List on 18.07.2023.</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. 22)

T.A. No. 29 of 2022

Km Naseem Jahan, D/o Late Sep Ahmed Shah Khan Petitioner
By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner: Shri, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Ms. Prerna Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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 Ms. Prerna Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>2. None is present for the petitioner. He is directed to file bench copy of the case.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the respondents seeks and is allowed four weeks time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>4. 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. 23)

O.A. No. 47 of 2016

Akhalesh Kumar Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Satendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>21.04.2023</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. On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Namit Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.2. None is present on behalf of the applicant.3. In the interest of justice, the case is passed over for the day.4. List on 24.07.2023. <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>