

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

**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW**  
**Court No.3 (Suppl. No. 1)**

**EX- A No. 211 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 184 of 2023**

**Ex L/Nk Atma Ram Mishra** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Advocate

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others** Respondents  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Mrs. Deepti P Bajpai, Advocate

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant for the applicant is present.</p> <p>2. This fresh execution has been filed for implementation of order dated 30.11.2022 passed in O.A. No. 184 of 2023. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks time to seek instructions and file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>3. List on <b>15.09.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b> <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p>

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

**EX- A No. 212 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 664 of 2022**

**Ex Hav Ram Prasad** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Mahendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others** Respondents  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh Chauhan, Advocate

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. Memo of Appearance filed by Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh Chauhan, 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. This fresh execution has been filed for implementation of order dated 02.02.2023 passed in O.A. No. 664 of 2022. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks time to seek instructions and file affidavit of compliance.</p> <p>3. List on <b>15.09.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></p>

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

**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW**  
**Court No.3 (Suppl. No. 3)**

**M. A. No. 1079 of 2023 with M. A. No. 1080 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 444 of 2023**

**Union of India & Others** Applicant-respondents  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicants: Shri JN Mishra, Advocate

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others** Respondent-applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri ....., Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. Heard Shri JN Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the applicants-respondents.</p> <p><b><u>M.A. No. 1079 of 2023</u></b></p> <p>2. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing application for leave to appeal.</p> <p>3. There is delay of 01 month and 18 days in filing leave to appeal.</p> <p>4. Submission of learned counsel for the applicants-Union of India &amp; Others is that delay in filing leave to appeal is not deliberate. His further submission is that after passing of the order dated 19.04.2023 there has been some delay in filing leave to appeal due to late receipt of instructions from the department. Thus, his submission is that delay is not deliberate, but for the reasons mentioned above and time taken by the department in processing the case for filing of the present application, delay of 01 month and 18 days is condonable in filing application for leave to appeal.</p> <p>5. We have gone through the affidavit filed in support of delay condonation application and find that the grounds and reasons shown in the accompanying affidavit for condonation of delay seem sufficient and therefore, delay in filing application is condoned. Delay condonation application stands disposed off.</p> <p><b><u>M.A. No. 1080 of 2023</u></b></p> <p>6. This application has been filed under Section 30 read with Section 31 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 against the judgment and order dated 19.04.2023 of this Tribunal passed in Original Application No 444 of 2023.</p> <p>7. After perusing the order impugned, we find that no much or less point of law of general public importance is involved in this case for grant of leave to appeal.</p> <p>8. Accordingly, leave to appeal is <b>rejected</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></p>

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

**EX- A. No. 86 of 2021 Inre O.A. No. 65 of 2020**

**Smt Chandrawati W/o Late Ex Sep Sita Ram** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Shyam Singh, learned counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Affidavit of compliance has not been filed. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that PPO has been issued and compliance report shall be submitted during course of the day.</p> <p>3. List on <b>31.07.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></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. 107 of 2021 Inre O.A. No. 104 of 2016**

**Smt Pankaj Singh** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Dharam Raj Singh, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present. Learned counsel for the applicant is not present.</p> <p>2. Affidavit of compliance is taken on record. Objection, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within a week.</p> <p>3. List on <b>31.07.2023</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></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. 78 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 497 of 2018**

**Nk (TS) Mistar Singh (Retd)** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Shailendra Kuamr Singh, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Sunil Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</li><li>2. Affidavit of compliance has already been filed.</li><li>3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that order has not been fully complied with. Learned counsel for the applicant may file objection on compliance report within two weeks.</li><li>4. Let notice be issued to respondent No 5 returnable within four weeks. Steps within a week.</li><li>5. List on <b>15.09.2023</b>.</li></ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b></span> <b>Member (A)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Member (J)</b></span></p> <p><i>rathore</i></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. 129 of 2022 Inre O.A. No. 188 of 2021

Ramesh Kumar Pal, S/o Late Ex Hav Ram Nath Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Advocate

Versus

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

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mrs Anju Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Affidavit of compliance has not been filed. Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is allowed four weeks further time to file affidavit of compliance. She further submits that cost shall be deposited by next date.</p> <p>3. List on <b>15.09.2023</b>.</p> <p>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p>(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>

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

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW  
Court No.3 (Sl. No. 5)

EX- A. No. 14 of 2023 Inre O.A. No. 557 of 2021

Smt Laxmi Bai @ Lachhi Devi W/o Late Ex Hav Radhey Lal Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Rohitash Kumar Sharma, Advocate

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Mrs Deepti P Bajpai, Advocate

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. None is present on behalf of the parties.</li><li>2. Affidavit of compliance has not been filed. Departmental Representative for the respondents submits that in compliance of order dated 20.05.2023 requisite documents have not been provided by the applicant.</li><li>3. Applicant is directed to provide required documents to the respondents within two weeks.</li><li>4. List on <b>15.09.2023</b>.</li></ol> <p>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain) Member (A) <i>rathore</i></p> <p>(Justice Anil Kumar) Member (J)</p>



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

**O.A. No. 52 of 2023**

**Ex L/Nk Abu Talib Anwar** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Gaurav Gupta, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Ashish Kumar Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents is present. Learned counsel for the applicant is not present.</p> <p>2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that rejoinder affidavit has not been filed. It is noticed that rejoinder affidavit has not been filed despite granting sufficient time. Therefore, opportunity to file rejoinder affidavit is closed.</p> <p>3. List on <b>15.09.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></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. 246 of 2023**

**Ex JWO Bharat Singh** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents is taken on record.</li><li>2. Heard Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar pandey, learned counsel for the respondents.</li><li>3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that after the Six Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1<sup>st</sup> July, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant being retired on 30.06.2022 is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2022 as per decision of the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of <b><i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i></b> (W.P. No. 15732 of 2017, decided on 15.09.2017).</li><li>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. 30.06.2022 as per policy in vogue since the date of annual increment falls on the following day i.e. 01.07.2022. Therefore, benefit of the Hon'ble Madras High Court order being <i>in personam</i> cannot be extended to the applicant and hence, Original Application is liable to be dismissed.</li><li>5. The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble Madra High Court in the case of <b><i>P. Ayamperumal Versus the Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others</i></b> (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 Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied</i></p></li></ol>

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

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 01.07.2021 to 30.06.2022, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2022, 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.

**(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)**  
**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. 262 of 2023**

**Ex Spr Lal Mani Rai**

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri VP Pandey, Advocate  
Shri RK Singh, Advocate, Shri DK Dixit, Advocate

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others**

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Advocate

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri VP Pandey, Shri RK Singh and Shri DK Dixit, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arun Kumar Sahu, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that he does not intend to file rejoinder affidavit.</p> <p>3. List for hearing on <b>21.09.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b> <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></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. 266 of 2023**

**Ex Swr Kalicharan 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 JN Mishra, Advocate

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi and Shri Anshuman Srivastava, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri JN Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondent No 1 to 4 are present.</li><li>2. Counter affidavit has not been filed.</li><li>3. Notice sent to respondent No 5 and 6 is deemed sufficient. No one is present on behalf of respondent No 5 and 6.</li><li>4. Learned counsel for the respondent No 1 to 4 prays for and is allowed four weeks further time to file counter affidavit.</li><li>5. List on <b>24.08.2023</b>.</li></ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></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. 361 of 2023 with M.A. No. 1065 of 2023**

**Ex NK (ACP Hav) Jaya Prakash** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Arvind Kumar Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p><b><u>M.A. No. 1065 of 2023</u></b></p> <p>2. This application has been filed for correction in O.A. No. 361 of 2023.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is typographical error while making O.A. in which word MACP has been erroneously typed in Paras 1, 4, 5 and 8 (b) in place of ACP. Applicant has moved correction application.</p> <p>4. We find that since after correction nature of O.A. will not be changed, correction application is allowed. Let amendment be incorporated during course of the day.</p> <p><b><u>O.A. No. 361 of 2023</u></b></p> <p>5. List on <b>21.09.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b> <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></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. 517 of 2023**

**Ex L/Nk Darshan Singh** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Wg Cdr Ajit Kakkar (Retd), Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. 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 is present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit has not been filed. Departmental representative for the respondents submits that parawise comments have been received. He prays for and is allowed four weeks further time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p>3. List on <b>20.09.2023</b>.</p> <p><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></p>

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

**O.A. No. 679 of 2023 with M.A. No. 820 of 2023**

**Ex LME (Reservist) Harshawan Joshi** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Sarvesh Kumar Verma, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Sarvesh Kumar Verma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Amit Jaiswal, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Objection on delay condonation application has not been filed by the respondents. Two weeks further time is granted to file objection on delay condonation application.</p> <p>3. List on <b>31.08.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b></span> <b>Member (A)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Member (J)</b></span></p> <p><i>rathore</i></p>



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

**T.A. No. 29 of 2022**

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

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri Iqbal Ahmed, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and Ms. Purna Singh, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Counter affidavit on behalf of the respondents is taken on record. Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the applicant within two weeks.</p> <p>3. Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to provide bench copy.</p> <p>4. List on <b>16.08.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b></span> <b>Member (A)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Member (J)</b></span></p> <p><i>rathore</i></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. 258 of 2017**

**Akil Ahmed Ansari** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri VP Pandey, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri RK Singh, Advocate holding brief for Shri VP Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri RC Shukla, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Written arguments on behalf of the applicant is taken on record.</p> <p>3. On request of learned counsel for the respondents, the case is passed over for the day.</p> <p>4. List on <b>16.08.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b> <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p>

**Form No. 4**  
**{See rule 11(1)}**  
**ORDER SHEET**  
**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW**  
**Court No.3 (Sl. No. 15)**

**O.A. No. 229of 2021**

**Ex Lance Nk Ram Soorat Mishra** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Yashpal Singh, Advocate

**Versus**

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

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri KP Datta, Advocate holding brief for Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal, Advocate holding brief for Shri Asheesh Agnihotri, Ld. Counsel for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. On request of brief holder, the case is passed over for the day.</p> <p>3. List on <b>17.08.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b> <i>rathore</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p>

**Form No. 4**  
**{See rule 11(1)}**  
**ORDER SHEET**  
**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW**  
**Court No.3 (Sl. No. 16)**

**O.A. No. 262 of 2021**

**Ex Sub Maj Nathu Lal Mishra** Applicant  
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant: Shri Yashpal Singh, Advocate

**Versus**

**Union of India & Others** Respondents  
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents: Shri Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate

<b>Notes of the Registry</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
	<p><b><u>24.07.2023</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)</u></b> <b><u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)</u></b></p> <p>1. On the case being taken up for hearing, Shri KP Datta, Advocate holding brief for Shri Yashpal Singh, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Maj Tarun, Departmental Representative for the respondents are present.</p> <p>2. Departmental Representative for the respondents submits that time be granted to file reply of rejoinder affidavit. He prays for and is granted two weeks further time to seek instructions and file affidavit clarifying the points raised in para 6 of the rejoinder affidavit.</p> <p>4. List on <b>17.08.2023</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)</b> <b>Member (A)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Justice Anil Kumar)</b> <b>Member (J)</b></p> <p><i>rathore</i></p>