

RESERVED

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW
COURT NO. 1

(1) O.A. No. 347 of 2015

Wednesday,, this the 10th day of February, 2016

Corum

**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Virendra Kumar DIXIT, Judicial Member
Hon’ble Lt Gen Gyan Bhushan, Administrative Member”**

No. 7106434K, Ex. Hav. (Hony Nb Sub) Ramagya Singh (Retired),
aged about 68 years, resident of Village: Deokali, Post : Satramganj,
Zamania, District : Gazipur, (UP) ... **Applicant**

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Defence, South Block, R.K. Puram, New Delhi –
110011.
2. Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension) Draupadi Ghat,
Allahabad (U.P.)
3. The Officers-in-Charge, Records EME, Secunderabad.
.... Respondents

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Applicant - Shri V.K. Pandey
Advocate

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Respondent - Mrs. Deepti Prasad Bajpai
C.G.S.C

(2) O.A. No. 348 of 2015

Ex Hav (Hony Naib Ris) Mohd Moinuddin Khan Applicant
Versus

Union of India and others Respondents

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Applicant - Shri V.K. Pandey,
Advocate

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Respondent- Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal
Sr. C.G.S.C

(3) O.A. No. 349 of 2015

Ex. Hav (Hony Naib Subedar) Raja Ram Applicant
Versus

Union of India and others Respondents

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Applicant - Shri V.K. Pandey,
Advocate

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Respondent - Shri Amit Jaiswal,
Advocate

(4) O.A. No. 350 of 2015

Ex Hav (Hony Naib Subedar) Aftab Ahmed Applicant
Versus

Union of India and others Respondents

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Applicant - Shri V.K. Pandey,
Advocate

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Respondent - Shri Sunil Sharma
Sr. C.G.C

(5) O.A. No. 351 of 2015

Ex. Hav. (Hony Naib Subedar) Kedar Ram Applicant
Versus

Union of India and others Respondents

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Applicant - Shri VK Pandey
Advocate

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Respondent - Shri Virendra Singh
Advocat.

(6) O.A. No. 353 of 2015

Ex. Hav. (Hony Naib Subedar)
Sheo Murat Rai, Applicant
Versus

Union of India and others Respondents

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Applicant - Shri V.K. Pandey
Advocate

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Respondent - Mrs. Deepti Prasad Bajpai
Sr. C.G.S.C

(7) O.A. No. 354 of 2015

Ex. Hav. (Hony Naib Subedar) Sheo Singh Yadav Applicant
 Versus
 Union of India and others Respondents

Ld. Counsel appeared for the Applicant - Shri V.K. Pandey,
 Advocate
 Ld. Counsel appeared for the Respondent - Shri Namit Sharma,
 C.G.S.C

ORDER**“Per Hon’ble Mr. Justice Virendra Kumar DIXIT, Judicial Member”**

1. This Bunch of cases is a bunch of 07 (Seven) Original Applications preferred by the Applicants seeking the reliefs in terms of the judgement of Hon’ble The Apex Court.
2. The above Original Applications have been preferred seeking the self same reliefs of implementing the Government instructions and releasing the entitled pension with arrears from 01.01.2006 to the applicants who were conferred Honorary ranks of Naib Subedars. Since the reliefs claimed are identical, Learned Counsel appearing for the parties agreed the Original Applications to be decided by a composite judgment and order. In the light of the above, this order shall dispose of the Application filed by the Applicant in the present case and by other Applicants in similar cases mentioned above.
3. A summary of necessary facts is that all the Applicants were enrolled in the Army and they retired on completion of terms and conditions in the Army from the rank of Havildar. They were bestowed honorary rank of Naib Subedar after retirement. The common grouse of the Applicants is that though the Applicants were sanctioned service pension of the rank of Havildar, they were not paid the pension and pensionary benefits of Honorary Naib Subedars as per the recommendations made by the 6th Pay Commission notwithstanding

several representations having been made by them to the Competent Authorities supported by several orders and judgments passed by the Armed Forces Tribunals, which received reinforcement from Hon'ble The Apex Court.

4. The precise submissions made on behalf of the Applicants are that notwithstanding recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission for grant of pension for all honorary ranks of Naib Subedar having been accepted as contained in Policy letter dated 12.06.2009 and circulated by the Adjutant General's Branch by letter dated 06.07.2009, revised pension in terms of letter dated 06.07.2009 has not yet been issued. All that the Applicants are getting against honorary rank of Naib Subedar is the paltry amount of Rs 100/- per month and that they are entitled to pension of the rank of Naib Subedar w.e.f 06.07.2009. To prop up the submission on this count, it was submitted that in **O.A No 42 of 2010 Virendra Singh and others v Union of India**, the Regional Bench of Armed Forces Tribunal at Chandigarh vide its order dated 8.2.2010 had allowed the relief similar to the relief as prayed by the Applicant in the instant case which decision was taken in challenge by the Union of India before **Hon'ble The Apex Court in SLP No 18582 of 2010**. The said SLP, it is stated, culminated in being dismissed by Hon'ble The Apex Court vide order dated 13.12.2010.

5. **Per contra**, Learned Counsel for the Respondents submitted that the Applicants were bestowed honorary rank after retirement for which ex-gratia to the extent of Rs 100/- per month was granted w.e.f 01.09.1995 in addition to their service pension and that their service pension was revised from time to time as per policy of the Government of India of the rank of Havildar. He further submitted

that since the Applicants had not been granted honorary rank during service, they were not eligible for service pension at par with Honorary Naib Subedars discharged on or after 1st Jan 2006. He also submitted that the Government of India, Ministry of Defence by means of letter No 1(8)/2008-D (Pen/Policy) dated 12th June 2009 has announced the policy decision whereby the benefits have been extended to the personnel who retired on or after 01.01.2006.

6. The recommendations of 6th Pay Commission being relevant are quoted below.

"5.1.62. Presently, Havildars on getting the rank of Honorary Naib Subedar are given an additional pension of Rs. 100. As against this, JCOs after becoming Honorary officers get pension as per the existing formula on the basis of pay attached to the post of Honorary officer. Defence Forces have proposed that the pension of Honorary Naib Subedars may also be fixed, accordingly, on the basis of pay attached to the post of Honorary officer. Defence Forces have proposed that the pension of Honorary Naib Subedars may also be fixed, accordingly, on the basis of pay attached to the rank. The proposal is inherent in the revised scheme of pay bands being proposed. A Havildar, on promotion as Honorary Naib Subedar will be eligible for pension with reference to the salary drawn/drawable in the rank of Naib Subedar. Further, pension is now payable with reference to either 10 months average emoluments or the last pay drawn, whichever is beneficial. In light of these changes being recommended, pension for all Honorary ranks of Naib Subedar will henceforth be payable by taking this placement as a regular promotion to the higher grade wherein benefit of fitment in the pay band and the higher grade pay will be taken into account for purposes of fixation of pension."

From the recommendations cited above, it would transpire that the essence of recommendation was that the benefits would accrue to all Havildars granted the honorary rank of Naib Subedars without any reservation or exception. It brooks no dispute that the Government letter dated 12.06.2009 was founded upon the recommendations of

the VI Pay Commission and from a punctilious reading, it does not imply that those who retired prior to 1.1.2006 were excluded from getting the benefits. The letter only says "the additional element of pension of Rs 100/- per month payable to Havildars granted to the Honorary rank of Naib Subedars as per Regulation 137 of Pension Regulations for the Army Part-1 (1961) and the MoD letter dated 6.11.1991 will cease to be paid with effect from 1.1.2006."

7. In the matter of benefits whether to be extended to Havildars who were conferred honorary rank of Naib Subedar on or after 01.01.2006, the Learned Counsel for the Applicants relied upon the judgment and order dated 8.2.2010 in the case of **O.A No 42 of 2010 Virendra Singh and Ors Vs. Union of India and Ors** passed by a Regional Bench of the Armed Forces Tribunal at Chandigarh. It may be noticed that in that case, a question had arisen in regard to the implementation of the orders **whether the petitioners and others who were granted honorary rank of Naib Subedars were to be entitled to a sum of Rs 100/- per month as honorary Naib Subedars in addition to their pension as Havildars or were also entitled to the pension of a Naib Subedar**. On a further question raised in that case based upon the Government of India Ministry of Defence by means of letter dated 3.6.2009, it was mentioned in the said order that this letter takes effect from 01.01.2006. On yet another question whether these benefits are to be extended to Havildars granted honorary rank of Naib Subedar on or after 01.01.2006, it was held by the Court that the date "**01.01.2006**" is the date when this letter came into effect and it does not carry connotation that the persons who retired pre-01.01.2006 would not be entitled to these benefits.

8. It thus follows from the above decision that the benefits as extended by that decision apply to all whether they were pre-01.01.2006 retirees or post -01.01.2006 retirees. It is worthy of notice here that the above order of the Armed Forces Tribunal Chandigarh Bench **in Virendra Singh's case** (supra) was assailed by the Union of India and upon scrutiny of the matter, Hon'ble The Apex Court dismissed S.L.P. by means of order dated 13.12.2010.

9. The decision in the case of **Virendra Singh's case** (supra) was relied upon while deciding **O.A No 3305 of 2013, Subhash Chander Soni vs Union of India** and in the said case, the Regional Bench of the Armed Forces Tribunal at Chandigarh while taking into account the ratio flowing from **Virendra Singh's case** held as under:

"In view of the above discussion, it is held that in all such cases the petitions deserve to be allowed relying upon the judgment of Virendra Singh's case (Supra) and the said judgment shall be implemented in cases of all the petitioners without any discrimination. However, the question of grant of interest in appropriate cases shall be considered in case the petitioners/similarly placed persons are not issued the revised PPOs in spite of these directions. The respondents shall take steps to make payment to all these such petitioners. In case of other similarly placed persons we are not fixing any time limit to make payment within three months since the number of such persons may be sufficiently large and it may take time to issue revised pension orders for them but steps shall be taken to issue the revised pension orders as early as possible."

10. It may also be noted here that after the dismissal of the SLP, the Tribunal delivered verdict deciding a bunch of as many as 35 cases on similar lines and in one of the case, the Union of India assailed the verdict of the Tribunal in Hon'ble The Apex Court by way of SLP.

Hon'ble The Apex Court dismissed the said Civil Appeal No 4677 of 2014 by means of order dated May 20, 2015, upholding and reiterating the view taken in Virendra Singh's case (supra). The order of Hon'ble The Apex Court is quoted below.

"From the reading of the impugned judgment of the Armed Forces Tribunal, it gets revealed that the Tribunal has relied upon its earlier judgment dated 8.2.2010 rendered in O.A. No 42 of 2010 titled as "Virendra Singh and Ors v. U.O.I" where identical relief was granted to the petitioners therein who were similarly situated. Further, we note that against the said judgment of the Tribunal, SLP © CC No 18582 of 2010 was preferred which was dismissed by this Court on 13.12.2010. We further find that by the impugned judgment, the Tribunal had decided 35 O.As and the Union of India has preferred the instant appeal only in one of those 35 cases. For all these reasons, we are not inclined to entertain this appeal which is dismissed accordingly. We, however, clarify that no interest shall be payable.

Two months' time is granted to the appellants to comply with the impugned judgment passed by the High Court."

11. In view of settled position as enunciated in **Virendra Singh's** case (supra) followed by the orders of Hon'ble The Apex Court dated 13.12.2010 dismissing the SLP of the Union of India preferred against the decision rendered in **Virendra Singh's** case, and the order of Hon'ble The Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 4677 of 2014 upholding the view of the Tribunal in **Virendra Singh's case (supra)**, we are of the view that the Applicants shall be entitled for the pension with reference to the salary drawn/drawable in the rank of Naib Subedar with effect from 01.01.2006

Order

12. In the result, the Original Applications as aforesaid are allowed to the extent that the Applicants shall be entitled for the pension with reference to the salary drawn/drawable in the rank of Naib Subedar with effect from 01.01.2006. The Applicants shall also be entitled to arrears w.e.f 01.01.2006. The Respondents are directed to comply with the order within 4 months from the date the certified copy of the judgment and order is produced before the authority concerned. In case, the Respondents fail to comply with the order within the stipulated period, the amount payable shall start earning interest @ 10% per annum from the date of order.

13. There will be no orders as to costs.

14. Let a copy of the judgment and order of date be placed on all connected Original Applications.

(Lt Gen Gyan Bhushan)
Administrative Member

(Justice Virendra Kumar DIXIT)
Judicial Member

Dated : February, ,2016