

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

O.A. No. 708 of 2023 with M.A. No. 859 of 2023

Ex Sub Jitendra Kumar Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Advocate
Shri Anshuman Srivastava, 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>05.07.2023</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 Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, 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. 859 of 2023</u></p> <p>2. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.</p> <p>3. As per office report, there is delay of 02 years, 08 months and 23 days in filing Original Application.</p> <p>4. Heard Shri Rahul Pal, Advocate holding brief for Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, learned counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application.</p> <p>5. Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that it is a pensionary matter in which bar of limitation is not applicable. His further submission is that delay in filing Original Application is not deliberate, but for the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of application.</p> <p>6. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents opposing the prayer submits that explanation of delay offered by the applicant is not sufficient and he has failed to offer day to day explanation of delay.</p> <p>7. 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. 708 of 2023</u></p> <p>9. Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p>10. Admit.</p> <p>11. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within next two weeks.</p> <p>12. List on 11.09.2023.</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.3 (Sl. No. 2)

O.A. No. 710 of 2023 with M.A. No. 861 of 2023

Ex Sub (Hony Lt) Gyanendra Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Advocate
Shri Girish Chandra Tripathi, 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>05.07.2023</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 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>2. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Rahul Pal, Advocate holding brief for Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi and Shri Girish Chandra Tripathi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the applicant intends to make some correction in O.A. Correction application shall be moved within a week.</p> <p>4. List on 18.08.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

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

EX- A. No. 228 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 603 of 2021

Ex Hav (Amb Asst) Mahendra Kumar Jena 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>05.07.2023</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 Parijaat Belaura, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Shyam Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.2. Affidavit of compliance has not been filed.3. Officer responsible for implementation of order of this Tribunal is not present today to clarify the reasons for non implementation of the order.4. Cost imposed has also not been deposited by the respondents.5. Departmental Representative for the respondents submits that the matter is pending before PIFA for getting financial concurrence w.e.f. 27.04.2023.6. Thus, it clearly shows that delay in implementation of the order of this Tribunal is due to laches on the part of PIFA.7. Registry is directed to issue notice to PIFA, Sena Bhawan, New Delhi through Defence Secretary to show cause as to why contempt proceedings be not initiated against her under Section 19 (1) of AFT Act, 2007 for intentionally delaying the implementation of order of this Tribunal.8. List on 12.09.2023.9. Copy of this order be supplied to learned counsel for the respondents. <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.3 (Sl. No. 4)

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>05.07.2023</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 Parijaat Belaura, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Rajesh Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Similar Matter is pending before the larger bench of AFT, PB, New Delhi.</p> <p>3. List on 13.09.2023.</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.3 (Sl. No. 5)

O.A. No. 977 of 2022

Smt Janki Devi W/o Late Ex Gnr Ram Shankar Rai Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri R Chandra, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>05.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri R Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that he does not intend to file rejoinder affidavit.</p> <p>3. List on 11.09.2023 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.3 (Sl. No. 6)

O.A. No. 351 of 2023

JWO Rajeev Kumar Singh (Retd) Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Amit Asthana, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>05.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.2. Heard Shri Amit Asthana, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar pandey, learned counsel for the respondents.3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being retired on 30.06.2018 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).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. 30.06.2018 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.5. The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble Madra High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:- <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied

the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, i.e., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M. Balasubramaniam, reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs.”

6. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2018, 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.

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 01.07.2017 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. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. accordingly. The respondents are further directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till the actual payment

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

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

rathore

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

O. A. No. 354 of 2023 with M.A. No. 408 of 2023

Driver Engine Static Tula Ram S/o Late Puran Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Gyanendra Kumar Pandey, 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>05.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Applicant has filed an affidavit that he is not satisfied with his previous counsel Shri Gyanendra Kumar Pandey, Advocate. He requested him to provide NOC for engaging new counsel but he refused. Therefore, he has engaged a new counsel Shri Vivek Tripathi, Advocate on his behalf who has filed Vakalatnama.</p> <p>2. Memo of appearance filed by Shri Vivek Tripathi, Advocate on behalf of the applicant is taken on record. His name shall be shown in the cause list when the case is listed next.</p> <p>3. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Vivek Tripathi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks further time to file objection on application for condonation of delay.</p> <p>5. List on 08.09.2023</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.3 (Sl. No. 8)

O. A. No. 389 of 2023 with M.A. No. 473 of 2023

Ex Hav/Clk Vinay Kumar Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Yashpal Singh, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>05.07.2023</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. 473 of 2023</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.2. As per office report, there is delay of 07 months and 01 day in filing Original Application.3. Heard Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application.4. 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.5. 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.6. 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.7. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly. <p><u>O.A. No. 389 of 2023</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">9. Matter needs adjudication.10. Admit.11. 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.12. List on 12.09.2023. <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.3 (Sl. No. 9)

O.A. No. 400 of 2023

Ex ACP Nk Manvendra Singh

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri KP Datta, 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>05.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Despite granting time counter affidavit has not been filed on behalf of the respondents.</p> <p>2. Heard Shri KP Datta, learned counsel for the applicant and Capt Priyanka Rathore, Departmental Representative for the respondents.</p> <p>3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being 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).</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 Madra High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“5. <i>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</i></p>

for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, i.e., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its [Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M. Balasubramaniam](#), reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs.”

6. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, on which date he was not in service, he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

7. In view of the above, the Original Application is allowed. The impugned order, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. accordingly. The respondents are further directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till the actual payment

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

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

rathore

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

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

O.A. No. 401 of 2023

Ex ACP Nk Vijay Kumar

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri KP Datta, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>05.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Despite granting time counter affidavit has not been filed on behalf of the respondents.</p> <p>2. Heard Shri KP Datta, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Adesh Kumar Gutpa, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being 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).</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 Madra High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“5. <i>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</i></p>

for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, i.e., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its [Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M. Balasubramaniam](#), reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs.”

6. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, on which date he was not in service, he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

7. In view of the above, the Original Application is allowed. The impugned order, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. accordingly. The respondents are further directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till the actual payment

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

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

rathore

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

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

O. A. No. 408 of 2023

Ex ACP Nk Ram Pal Singh

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri KP Datta, 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>05.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Despite granting time counter affidavit has not been filed on behalf of the respondents.</p> <p>2. Heard Shri KP Datta, learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Gyan Singh, learned counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being 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).</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 Madra High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, i.e., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its [Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M. Balasubramaniam](#), reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs.”

6. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, on which date he was not in service, he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

7. In view of the above, the Original Application is allowed. The impugned order, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. accordingly. The respondents are further directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till the actual payment

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

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

rathore

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

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

O.A. No. 410 of 2023

Ex ACP Nb Sub Tikendra

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri KP Datta, 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>05.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Despite granting time counter affidavit has not been filed on behalf of the respondents.</p> <p>2. Heard Shri KP Datta, learned counsel for the applicant and Capt Priyanka Rathore, Departmental Representative for the respondents.</p> <p>3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being 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).</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 Madra High Court in the case of <i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i> (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"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</i></p>

for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, i.e., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its [Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M. Balasubramaniam](#), reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs.”

6. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2021, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2021, on which date he was not in service, he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service.

7. In view of the above, the Original Application is allowed. The impugned order, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. accordingly. The respondents are further directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum till the actual payment

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

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

rathore

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

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

O.A. No. 574 of 2023 with M.A. No. 706 of 2023

Mrs Devaki Maya Gurung W/o Late Ex Rfn Dhan Bahadur Gurung Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Col AK Srivastava (Retd), Advocate, Shri
Dharam Raj Singh, Advocate, Shri Amarendu Srivastava, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>05.07.2023</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. 706 of 2023</u></p> <p>2. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.</p> <p>3. As per office report, there is delay of 04 in filing Original Application.</p> <p>4. Heard Shri AK Srivastava (Retd), learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, learned counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application.</p> <p>5. Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that it is a pensionary matter in which bar of limitation is not applicable. His further submission is that delay in filing Original Application is not deliberate, but for the reasons stated in affidavit filed in support of application.</p> <p>6. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents opposing the prayer submits that explanation of delay offered by the applicant is not sufficient and he has failed to offer day to day explanation of delay.</p> <p>7. 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. 574 of 2023</u></p> <p>9. Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p>10. Admit.</p> <p>11. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted four weeks time to file counter affidavit, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within next two weeks.</p> <p>12. List on 14.09.2023.</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.3 (Sl. No.14)

O.A. No. 619 of 2023 with M.A. No. 750 of 2023

Ex Hav Sarjeet Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Wg Cdr Ajit Kakkar (Retd), Advocate
Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>05.07.2023</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 Rahul Pal, Advocate holding brief for Wg Cdr Ajit Kakkar (Retd) and Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Objection on delay condonation application has not been filed by the respondents.</p> <p>3. As prayed, two weeks further time is granted to learned counsel for the respondents for filing objection on delay condonation application.</p> <p>4. List on 10.08.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>