

Court No. 1**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 839 of 2022**Thursday, this the 16th day of February, 2023**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)”****“Hon’ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)”**

No. 674138-S, JWO Indra Dev (Retd.),
 S/o Manik Chand Gupta,
 R/o House No. 63B/513A,
 Aheer Pada, Sohalla, Pratap Pura,
 District – Agra, Uttar Pradesh -282001.

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri Chaturbhuj Dwivedi**, Advocate.
 Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. Chief of Air Staff, Air Head Quarter, Vayu Bhawan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi -110011.
3. Air Force Record Office, P&W Wing (DP), Subroto Park, New Delhi -110010.
4. DDPA –III, Air Headquarters (VB), New Delhi -110106.
5. Directorate of Air Veterans –III (A&N Appeals), Air Headquarters, Air Force Record Office Building, 3rd Floor, Subroto Park, New Delhi -110010.
6. Office of the Joint Controller of Defence Accounts (Air Force), C/o AFCAO, Subroto Park, New Delhi -110010.
7. Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Draupadi Ghat, Prayagraj (U.P)-211014.

.....**Respondents**

Ld. Counsel for the : **Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal**, Advocate
 Respondents Central Govt. Counsel

ORDER**“Per Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)”**

1. The instant Original Application has been filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for the following reliefs :-

- (a) *To quash and set aside the impugned order dated 18 May 2010 passed by respondent No. 3 vide letter No. RO/2703/674138/02/11/P&W(DP)/RMB and order 09 Nov 2010 passed by first appellate committee respondent No. 4 in the 1st appeal against rejection of Disability pension claim of the applicant vide letter No. Air HQ/41002/45/10/JWO/PA-III.(Annexure A-1 and A-2 to compilation No.1).*
- (b) *To direct the respondent concerned to consider the claim of the applicant for grant of disability considering the disablement 30% for Secondary (renal) hypertension (Old) Z-09 along with the composite assessment 30% for life long in medical Category A4G2 (P) during duty period.*
- (c) *To direct the respondent concerned to pay the dues of the disability pension with arrear which applicable to the applicant since 01 March 2011.*
- (d) *To issue any suitable order or direction which this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper under the present facts and circumstances of the case.*
- (e) *To award the cost of proceeding to the applicant.*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was enrolled in the Indian Air Force on 03.02.1982 and was discharged from service on 28.02.2011 in Low Medical Category on fulfilling the conditions of his enrolment. At the time of discharge from service, the Release Medical Board (RMB) held at 405 Air Force Station on 01.04.2010 assessed his disabilities "SECONDARY (RENAL) HYPERTENSION(OLD)" @ 30% for life and "HYPERCHOLESTEROLEMIA (OLD)" @ 1-5% for life composite disabilities @33.5% for life and opined the disabilities to be neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service. The applicant's claim

for grant of disability pension was rejected vide letter dated 18.05.2010. The applicant preferred First Appeal dated 28.06.2010 which too was rejected by the respondents. It is in this perspective that the applicant has preferred the present Original Application.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant pleaded that at the time of enrolment, the applicant was found mentally and physically fit for service in the Air Force and there is no note in the service documents that he was suffering from any disease at the time of enrolment in Air Force. The diseases of the applicant were contracted during the service, hence they are attributable to and aggravated by Air Force Service. He submitted that his case is covered with the judgment of this Tribunal in O.A. No. 12 of 2022, **Pushkar Prasad Shukla vs. Union of India and Others**, decided on 24.05.2022 and pleaded that various Benches of Armed Forces Tribunal have granted disability pension in similar cases, as such the applicant be granted disability pension and its rounding off to 50%.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that composite disability of the applicant @ 33.5% for life has been regarded as NANA by the RMB being originated in peace station and not connected with service, as per Regulation 153 of Pension Regulations for the IAF, 1961 (Part – I) the applicant is not entitled to disability element of disability pension. He pleaded for dismissal of the Original Application

5. We have heard Ld. Counsel for the applicant as also Ld. Counsel for the respondents. We have also gone through the Release Medical Board proceedings as well as the records and we find that the questions which need to be answered are of two folds:-

- (a) Whether the disabilities of the applicant are attributable to or aggravated by Air Force Service?
- (b) Whether the applicant is entitled for the benefit of rounding off the disability element of disability pension?

6. The law on attributability of a disability has already been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Dharamvir Singh Versus Union of India & Others***, reported in (2013) 7 Supreme Court Cases 316. In this case the Apex Court took note of the provisions of the Pensions Regulations, Entitlement Rules and the General Rules of Guidance to Medical Officers to sum up the legal position emerging from the same in the following words.

"29.1. Disability pension to be granted to an individual who is invalided from service on account of a disability which is attributable to or aggravated by military service in non-battle casualty and is assessed at 20% or over. The question whether a disability is attributable to or aggravated by military service to be determined under the Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982 of Appendix II (Regulation 173).

29.2. A member is to be presumed in sound physical and mental condition upon entering service if there is no note or record at the time of entrance. In the event of his subsequently being discharged from service on medical grounds any deterioration in his health is to be presumed due to service [Rule 5 read with Rule 14(b)].

29.3. The onus of proof is not on the claimant (employee), the corollary is that onus of proof that the condition for non-entitlement is with the employer. A claimant has a right to derive benefit of any reasonable doubt and is entitled for pensionary benefit more liberally (Rule 9).

29.4. If a disease is accepted to have been as having arisen in service, it must also be established that the conditions of military service determined or contributed to the onset of the disease and that the conditions were due to the circumstances of duty in military service [Rule 14(c)]. [pic]

29.5. If no note of any disability or disease was made at the time of individual's acceptance for military service, a disease which has led to an individual's discharge or death will be deemed to have arisen in service [Rule 14(b)].

29.6. If medical opinion holds that the disease could not have been detected on medical examination prior to the acceptance for service and that disease will not be deemed to have arisen during service, the Medical Board is required to state the reasons [Rule 14(b)]; and 29.7. It is mandatory for the Medical Board to follow the guidelines laid down in Chapter II of the Guide to Medical Officers (Military Pensions), 2002 - "Entitlement: General Principles", including Paras 7, 8 and 9 as referred to above (para 27)."

7. In view of the settled position of law on attributability, we find that the RMB has denied attributability to the applicant only by endorsing that the composite disabilities 'SECONDARY (RENAL) HYPERTENSION(OLD)' and 'HYPERCHOLESTEROLEMIA (OLD)' are neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground of onset of disabilities in June 2007 while posted in Peace location (Belgaum) and not related to military service, therefore, applicant is not entitled to disability element of disability pension. However, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the opinion that this

reasoning of Release Medical Board for denying disability pension to applicant is not convincing and doesn't reflect the complete truth on the matter. Peace Stations have their own pressure of rigorous Air Force training and associated stress and strain of Air Force service. The applicant was enrolled in Indian Air Force on 03.02.1982 and the disabilities have started after more than 24 years of Air Force service i.e. in June 2007. We are therefore of the considered opinion that the benefit of doubt in these circumstances should be given to the applicant in view of ***Dharamvir Singh*** (supra), and the disability of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by Air Force service.

8. The law on the point of rounding off of disability pension is no more RES INTEGRA in view of Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment in the case of ***Union of India and Ors vs Ram Avtar & Ors*** (Civil appeal No 418 of 2012 decided on 10th December 2014). In this Judgment the Hon'ble Apex Court nodded in disapproval of the policy of the Government of India in granting the benefit of rounding off of disability pension only to the personnel who have been invalided out of service and denying the same to the personnel who have retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of their tenure of engagement. The relevant portion of the decision is excerpted below:-

“4. By the present set of appeals, the appellant (s) raise the question, whether or not, an individual, who has retired on attaining the age of superannuation or on completion of his tenure of engagement, if found to be suffering from some disability which is attributable to or aggravated by the military service, is entitled to be granted the benefit of

rounding off of disability pension. The appellant(s) herein would contend that, on the basis of Circular No 1(2)/97/D (Pen-C) issued by the Ministry of Defence, Government of India, dated 31.01.2001, the aforesaid benefit is made available only to an Armed Forces Personnel who is invalidated out of service, and not to any other category of Armed Forces Personnel mentioned hereinabove.

5. *We have heard Learned Counsel for the parties to the lis.*

6. *We do not see any error in the impugned judgment (s) and order(s) and therefore, all the appeals which pertain to the concept of rounding off of the disability pension are dismissed, with no order as to costs.*

7. *The dismissal of these matters will be taken note of by the High Courts as well as by the Tribunals in granting appropriate relief to the pensioners before them, if any, who are getting or are entitled to the disability pension.*

8. *This Court grants six weeks' time from today to the appellant(s) to comply with the orders and directions passed by us."*

9. It is also observed that claim for pension is based on continuing wrong and relief can be granted if such continuing wrong creates a continuing source of injury. In the case of **Shiv Dass vs. Union of India**, reported in 2007 (3) SLR 445, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed:

"In the case of pension the cause of action actually continues from month to month. That, however, cannot be a ground to overlook delay in filing the petition. It would depend upon the fact of each case. If petition is filed beyond a reasonable period say three years normally the Court would reject the same or restrict the relief which could be granted to a reasonable period of about three years. The High Court did not examine whether on merit appellant had a case. If on merits it would have found that there was no scope for interference, it would have dismissed the writ petition on that score alone."

10. As such, in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Ram Avtar** (supra) and **Shiv Dass** (supra), we are of the considered view that benefit of rounding off of disability pension @ 33.5% for life to be rounded off to 50% for life may be extended to the applicant from three preceding years from the date of filing of the Original Application.

11. In view of the above, the Original Application No. 839 of 2022 deserves to be allowed, hence **allowed**. The impugned order passed by the respondents is set aside. The disabilities of the applicant are held as aggravated by Air Force service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @33.5% for life which would be rounded off to 50% for life three preceding years from the date of filing of the Original Application. The respondents are directed to grant disability element to the applicant @33.5% for life duly rounded off to 50% for life prior three years from the date of filing of the Original Application. The date of filing of Original Application is 07.10.2022. 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

12. No order as to costs.

13. Pending Misc. Application(s), if any, shall stand disposed off.

(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

Dated : 16th February, 2023

SB/Ashok

