

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

Supplementary Cause List

O.A. No. 743 of 2023 with M.A. No. 897 of 2023

Ex Hav Krishnendu Patra

Applicant

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

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Dr. Gyan Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>07.07.2023</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 Dr. Gyan 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><u>M.A. No. 897 of 2023</u></p> <p>3. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.</p> <p>4. As per office report, there is delay of 09 months and 26 days in filing Original Application.</p> <p>5. Heard Shri R Chandra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Gyan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application.</p> <p>6. 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>7. 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>8. 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>9. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 743 of 2023</u></p> <p>10. Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p>11. Admit.</p> <p>12. 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>13. List on 25.08.2023.</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/165 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 161 of 2022

Ex Sgt Kapil Sharma Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate
Mrs. Upasna Mishra, Advocate and Shri Satya Narayan Mishra, 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>07.07.2023</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 Ashish 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>2. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Mrs. Upasna Mishra and Shri Satya Narayan Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>3. This is a fresh execution application filed for implementation of order dated 27.05.2022 passed in O.A. No. 161 of 2022.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks time to seek instructions and file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>5. List on 18.09.2023.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh) (Justice Anil Kumar) Member (A) 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. 1)

O.A. No. 739 of 2023 with M.A. No. 894 of 2023

Ex JWO Swami Satyanand Pandey

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate
Mrs. Upasna Mishra, Advocate, Shri Kapil Sharma, 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>07.07.2023</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 Shyam 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><u>M.A. No. 894 of 2023</u></p> <p>3. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing Original Application.</p> <p>4. As per office report, there is delay of 09 months and 26 days in filing Original Application.</p> <p>5. Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Shyam Singh, learned counsel for the respondents on delay condonation application.</p> <p>6. 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>7. 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>8. 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>9. Accordingly, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands decided accordingly.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 739 of 2023</u></p> <p>10. Matter needs adjudication.</p> <p>11. Admit.</p> <p>12. 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>13. List on 30.08.2023.</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. 314 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 283 of 2020

Ex Sub (Hony Lt) Bhuri Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Shailendra Kumar 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>07.07.2023</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 Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.2. In spite of grant of repeated opportunity order dated 20.09.2021 has not been complied with and cost has not been paid.3. Order under implementation has been passed by this Tribunal on 20.09.2021. There is no proper explanation of delay in implementation of the order.4. Order of the Tribunal is only for payment of interest for delayed payment.5. Maj Tarun, Departmental Representative for the respondents today present before the Tribunal apprised the bench that financial concurrence has been given by PIFA and presently the matter has been dispatched to PS4 for further action towards implementation of the order.6. In the circumstances of the case we are of the view that it will be proper to attach the property of the respondent(s) responsible for non compliance of the order.7. Applicant is directed to submit a list of some properties of the respondents suitable for implementation of the order.8. List on 05.09.2023.9. Let copy of this order be provided to learned counsel for the respondents. <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. 331 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 868 of 2021

Ex Sep Bhopal Singh Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Sudhir Kumar Singh, 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>07.07.2023</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 Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present. Learned counsel for the applicant is not present.</p> <p>2. Neither order has been complied with nor has the cost imposed been deposited.</p> <p>3. It is made clear that if the order of this Tribunal is not complied by the next date, officer responsible for non implementation of order of this Tribunal shall remain present before this Tribunal.</p> <p>4. List on 24.08.2023.</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. 4)

O.A. No. 989 of 2022

Smt Pin Maya Kumal W/o Late Ex Sub Tek Bahadur Thapa 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>07.07.2023</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, Col AK Srivastava (Retd), Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Rejoinder affidavit on behalf of the applicant is taken on record.</p> <p>3. Pleadings are complete and the case is ripe for hearing.</p> <p>4. List on 28.08.2023.</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)

O.A. No. 137 of 2023

Ex WO (HFL) Shiv Narayan

Applicant

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

Shri Rakesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Mrs. Amrita Chakraborty, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>07.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Counter affidavit on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>2. Heard Shri VP Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs Amrita Chakraborty, 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 30.06.2016 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).</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. 30.06.2016 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2016. 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</i></p>

Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others (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:-

“5. The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on 30.06.2013 on attaining the age of superannuation. After the Sixth Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July as the date of increment for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied

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

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

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

6. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we are of the view that since the applicant had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2016, but the increment fell due on the next day of his retirement 01.07.2016, 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 01.07.2015 to 30.06.2016, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2016, 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. 6)

O.A. No. 232 of 2023

Smt KalpanaTripathi W/o Late HavYatindra Kumar Tripathi Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ashok Kumar, 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>07.07.2023</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, Mrs. Kavita Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present. Ld. Counsel for the applicant is not present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by the applicant within two weeks</p> <p>3. List on 30.08.2023.</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. 358 of 2023

JWO Ishwer Dayal Gupta (Retd)

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Kapil Sharma, Advocate,
Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Advocate, Mrs. Upasna Mishra, 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>07.07.2023</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)</u></p> <p>1. Counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</p> <p>2. Heard Shri Raj Kumar Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ld. 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</p>

Hon'ble Madra High Court in the case of *P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others* (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:-

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

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

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

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

7. In view of the above, the Original Application is allowed. The impugned order, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as

he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. 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. 8)

O.A. No. 402 of 2023 with M.A. No. 605 of 2023

Smt Maya Kumari Chhetri W/o Late Ex Hav Chitra Bahadur Limbu Applicant
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri R Chandra, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>07.07.2023</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 Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p><u>M.A. No. 605 of 2023</u></p> <p>2. This application has been moved by the applicant to amend the array of parties in Original Application.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the amendment will not change the nature of the case.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the respondents has no objection.</p> <p>5. Accordingly, the amendment application is allowed. Applicant is directed to incorporate the amendment during course of the day.</p> <p>6. Learned counsel for the respondents seeks and is allowed four weeks time to file counter affidavit to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks next.</p> <p><u>O.A. No. 402 of 2023</u></p> <p>7. List on 31.08.2023.</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. 431 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 Yogesh Kesarwani, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>07.07.2023</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 KP Datta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks time to file counter affidavit, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks next.</p> <p>3. List on 01.09.2023.</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. 432 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: Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>07.07.2023</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 KP Datta, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed three weeks time to file counter affidavit, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks next.</p> <p>3. List on 29.08.2023.</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. 11)

O.A. No. 610 of 2023

Nb Sub (Opr) Pradeep Kumar Singh 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: Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>07.07.2023</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 Manoj Kumar Awasthi and Shri Anshuman Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks time to file counter affidavit, to which rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks next.</p> <p>3. List on 10.08.2023.</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. 12)

T.A. No. 52 of 2022

Ex Sep/ASH Ujair Bahadur Thapa Petitioner
By Legal Practitioner for the Petitioner: Shri....., Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri GS Sikarwar, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>07.07.2023</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, none is present on behalf of the petitioner. Shri GS Sikarwar, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present.</p> <p>2. Bench copy has not been provided.</p> <p>3. Petitioner is further directed to provide bench copy within two weeks.</p> <p>4. List on 14.09.2023.</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>