

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No.2 (Sl. No. 1)

O.A. No. 255 of 2023 with M.A. No. 268 of 2023

Smt Sumitra Devi, W/o Late Ex Spr Chhabinath Singh

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Advocate, Shri Girish Tiwari, Advocate, Shri Dheerendra Kumar Agnihotri, Advocate, Shri Sandeep Tripathi, Advocate and Shri Vishnu Kant Awasthi, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Mrs Deepti P Bajpai, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Memo of appearance filed by Mrs Deepti P Bajpai, 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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs Deepti P Bajpai, learned counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that he wants to withdraw this O.A. He further submits that he may be permitted to file this O.A. afresh.</p> <p>As prayed, learned counsel for the applicant is permitted to withdraw this O.A. with liberty to file afresh.</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)

O.A. No. 256 of 2023 with M.A. No. 269 of 2023

Ex Hav Shyam Lal Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, 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>29.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Memo of appearance filed by Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, 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. 269 of 2023</u></p> <p>This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application. Heard Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application. As per office report, there is delay of 57 days in filing Original Application. 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. 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. 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. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 256 of 2023</u></p> <p>Matter needs adjudication. Admit. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within next two weeks. List on 02.06.2023.</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)
O.A. No. 257 of 2023 with M.A. No. 272 of 2023

Ex Nk Kedar Nath Thakur Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, 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>29.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u> Memo of appearance filed by Mrs Anju 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>On the case being taken up for hearing Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 272 of 2023</u> This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application. Heard Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application. As per office report, there is delay of 05 months and 27 days in filing Original Application. 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. 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. 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. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 257 of 2023</u> Matter needs adjudication. Admit. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within next two weeks. 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. 4)

EX-A. No. 135 of 2022

Ex Gdsm Rohitaswa Verma Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Yashpal 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>29.03.2023</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 Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted three weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 12.05.2023.</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. 152 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 21 of 2018

Ex Nk/SKT Uma Shankar Yagik Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Col AK Srivastava (Retd), 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>29.03.2023</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 Col AK Srivastava (Retd), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed three weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance alongwith copy of Re-survey Medical Board (RSMB) conducted on 14.12.2022.</p> <p>List on 12.05.2023.</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)

EX-A. No. 353 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 785 of 2021

Ex Sub (Nur Tech) Dhanabalan R Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri KKS Bisht, 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>29.03.2023</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 VP Pandey, Advocate holding brief for Shri KKS Bisht, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents submits that Govt sanction has been accorded on 14.03.2023. He prays for and is allowed two weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 16.05.2023.</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. 7)

EX-A. No. 375 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 55 of 2022

Ex Hav Raghu Raj 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 RC Shukla, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</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 Vijay Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents submits that PPO in this case has been issued on 27.03.2023. He seeks and is allowed two weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance alongwith copy of PPO.</p> <p>List on 16.05.2023.</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. 8)

EX-A. No. 38 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 34 of 2022

Ex Nk Ram Babu Pal Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri JN Mishra, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</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 Gyanendra Kumar Mishra, Advocate holding brief for Shri JN Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Gyan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted two weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 16.05.2023.</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. 9)

O.A. No. 65 of 2022

Ex Sub Maj Nigam Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Rohitash Kumar Sharma, 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>29.03.2023</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 Rohitash Kumar Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri DK Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Counter affidavit filed by learned counsel for the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned counsel for the applicant submits that he does not intend to file rejoinder affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Arguments concluded.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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. 10)

O.A. No. 247 of 2022

Ex Hav (Hony Nb Sub) Ram Chet Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Parijaat Belaura, 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>29.03.2023</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 Shri Rajesh Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Similar matter is pending before the Larger Bench of AFT (PB), New Delhi.</p> <p>List on 05.07.2023.</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. 11)

O.A. No. 587 of 2022

Malti Devi W/o Late Sarju Prasad Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Gaurav Singh, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</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 Jai Narayan Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>None is present on behalf of the applicant. The records shows that learned counsel for the applicant has not attended the court on previous dates also.</p> <p>Accordingly, the case is dismissed due to non prosecution.</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. 12)

O.A. No. 759 of 2022

Ex Hav Vishweshwar Dayal Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Advocate
Shri Girish Tiwari, Advocate
Ms. Sunita Singh, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</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 Vijay Kumar Pandey Shri Girish Tiwari and Ms. Sunita Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Alok Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant has been granted his dues for which this O.A. was filed. He further submits that this O.A. has become infructuous.</p> <p>Accordingly, the case is dismissed being infructuous.</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. 863 of 2022 with M.A. No. 1094 of 2022

Smt Hemlata W/o Late Ex Sep Manoj Kumar Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Veer Raghav Chaubey, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</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, learned counsel for respondent No 1 to 3 and Mohd Zafar Khan, Ld. Counsel for the respondent No 5 are present.</p> <p>None is present on behalf of the applicant.</p> <p>Mohd Zafar Khan, learned counsel for the respondent No 5 submits that sometime be given for filing counter affidavit.</p> <p>As prayed, two weeks time is granted as last opportunity to file counter affidavit on behalf of respondent No 5.</p> <p>List on 19.05.2023.</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. 14)

O.A. No. 889 of 2022

Shubhamdeep Pandey,
S/o Late Ex Sub Shashi Bhushan Pandey & Others Applicants
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants: Shri Yashpal Singh, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</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 applicants and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani and Shri Raj Priya Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Shri Raj Priya Srivastava, learned counsel for respondent No 9 prays for and granted two weeks time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks next.</p> <p>List on 19.05.2023.</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. 15)

O.A. No. 890 of 2022

Ex L/NK Ramakant Prasad Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ved Prakash, Advocate
Shri Devendra Kumar, Advocate
Shri Vinay Pandey, 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>29.03.2023</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 Ved Prakash, Shri Devendra Kumar and Shri Vinay Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Chet Narayan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks next.</p> <p>List on 01.06.2023.</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. 1027 of 2022

Hony Sub Mahboob Ali (Retd) Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Santosh Singh, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</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 Santosh Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Devesh Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within next two weeks.</p> <p>List on 22.05.2023.</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. 17)

O.A. No. 125 of 2023

Ex Sgt Vimal Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Keshav Sharma, 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>29.03.2023</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 Keshav Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajiv Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit filed by Ld. Counsel for the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Sixth Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being enrolled on 16.12.2002 and retired on 31.12.2022 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.01.2023 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. 31.12.2022 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.01.2023. 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 31.12.2022, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.01.2023, 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 01.01.2021 to 31.12.2022, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell due on 01.01.2023, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose, after verifying documents.

8. 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

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

10. No order as to costs.

(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. 18)

O.A. No. 132 of 2023

Ex JWO Manikant Pathak Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Amit Asthana, 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>29.03.2023</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 Amit Asthana, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Manu Kumar Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit filed by the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Sixth Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being enrolled on 30.06.1994 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 Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“5. The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on</p>

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 due on 01.07.2021, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose, after verifying documents.

8. 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

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

10. No order as to costs.

(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. 19)

O.A. No. 161 of 2023

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

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>29.03.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms Kavita Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Sixth Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being enrolled on 24.06.1995 and retired on 30.06.2022 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2022 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>3. 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. 30.06.2022 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2022. 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>4. 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> <p style="text-align: center;">“5. <i>The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on</i></p>

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."

5. 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 30.06.2022, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2022, on which date he was not in service, he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

6. 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 01.07.2021 to 30.06.2022, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell due on 01.07.2022, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose, after verifying documents.

7. 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.

9. No order as to costs.

(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. 20)

O.A. No. 220 of 2016

Radhey Shyam Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, 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>29.03.2023</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 Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that comments were asked vide letter dated 13.01.2023. He further submitted that in response to this letter, Records, the Rajput Regiment, Fatehgarh has written to PAO (OR) on 16.02.2023 asking to forward comments to AFT Legal Cell.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned counsel for the respondents is directed to obtain comments within two weeks and place on record for perusal of the Bench.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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>