

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.1)
O.A. No. 82 of 2023 with M.A. No. 74 of 2023

JWO Ram Ashish Vishwakarma (Retd)

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

1. Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate
2. Shri Kapil Sharma, Advocate
3. Ms. Upasna Mishra, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for the Respondents

Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 Bipin Kumar Singh, Advocate on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. His name shall be shown as counsel for the respondents when the case is listed next.</p> <p>On the case being Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Bipin Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 74 of 2023</u></p> <p>This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.</p> <p>As per office report, there is a delay of 02 years and 01 month in filing Original Application.</p> <p>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>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>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>Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 82 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, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within next two weeks.</p> <p>List on 23.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 193 of 2018 Inre O.A. No. 145 of 2013

Satendra Singh Pal Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant
Shri Pankaj Kumar Shukla, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for the Respondents
1. Shri Namit Sharma, Advocate
2. Shri D.C. Lohumi, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 Pankaj Kumar Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Namit Sharma and Shri D.C. Lohumi, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Compliance report filed by respondent No 6 is taken on record.</p> <p>Objection, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks.</p> <p>List on 03.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 28 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 459 of 2018

Sub Madho Prasad By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant Wg Cdr Ajit Kakkar (Retd), Advocate	Applicant
Versus	
Union of India & Others By Legal Practitioner for the Respondents Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate	Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Advocate holding brief for Wg Cdr Ajit Kakkar (Retd.), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant prays for and is granted two weeks time to file objection, if any, on compliance report.</p> <p>List on 03.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

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

Ex. A. No. 229 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 171 of 2020

Smt Suman Devi, W/o Late Ex Lance Nk Ramesh Chandra Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant
Shri K K Misra, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 K K Misra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks further time as last opportunity to file compliance report.</p> <p>List on 23.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.5)

Ex. A. No. 353 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 785 of 2021

Ex Sub (Nur Tech) Dhanabalan R
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant
Shri K K S Bisht, Advocate

Applican

Versus

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

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 KKS Bisht, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed by learned counsel for the respondents four weeks further time is granted to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 23.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.6)

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>19.01.2023</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>As prayed by learned counsel for the respondents four weeks further time is granted to file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>List on 23.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.7)
O.A. No. 575 of 2019

Smt Roopa Singh Teveotia,
W/o Ex Hav (Late) Aman Pal Singh Teveotia
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant
Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate

Applicant

Versus

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

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 Vinay Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>On request of learned counsel for the applicant the case is passed over for the day.</p> <p>List on 24.03.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.8)

O.A. No. 155 of 2021

Nb Sub (RT) Pushkar Mishra

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

1. Shri Ashutosh Shahi, Advocate
2. Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, 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>19.01.2023</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 Ashutosh Shahi and Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Appoli Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>As prayed by learned counsel for the applicant, list the case on 08.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.9)

O.A. No. 234 of 2022

Ex Sep Nayan Singh

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant
Wg Cdr SN Dwivedi (Retd), Advocate

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents
Shri Amit Jaiswal, Advocate

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 Wg Cdr SN Dwivedi (Retd), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Advocate holding brief for Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>On request made by brief holder the case is adjourned.</p> <p>List on 08.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.10)

O.A. No. 1074 of 2022

Ex Sub Shishu Pal Singh

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

1. Shri VP Pandey, Advocate

2. Shri Rakesh Kumar Singh, 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>19.01.2023</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 VP Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs Kavita Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. 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 28.06.1990 and retired on 30.06.2020 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2016 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. 30.06.2020 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>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 30.06.2020, 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.

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 01.07.2019 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

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

8. No order as to costs.

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

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

O.A. No. 1076 of 2022

Ex HFO Kamlesh Kumar Mishra

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

1. Shri VP Pandey, Advocate
2. Shri Rakesh Kumar Singh, 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>19.01.2023</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 Raj Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ram Saran Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>2. 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 21.04.1981 and retired on 30.06.2018 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2018 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. 30.06.2018 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2018. 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 30.06.2018, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2018, 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 01.07.2017 to 30.06.2018, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2018, 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

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

8. No order as to costs.

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.12)

O.A. No. 228 of 2015

Ramesh Chandra Dixit
In person

Applicant

Versus

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

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.01.2023</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 the applicant in person and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays and is granted last opportunity of three weeks time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>List on 23.02.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
Court No.3 (Sl. No.13)

O.A. No. 642 of 2021

Chandra Bhan Singh (through Parokar Vivek Singh (Son)) Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant
1. Shri Ishan Baghel, Advocate
2. Ms. Veena Rajes, 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>19.01.2023</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 Ishan Baghel and Ms. Veena Rajes, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>On request made by learned counsel for the respondents the case is passed over for the day.</p> <p>List on 24.03.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p> <p>rathore</p>