

**Court No. 1****ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 14 of 2019**Wednesday, this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2020**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)  
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**No. 7778130-H, Ex. Nk. Krishna Kumar S/o Bharat Chandra Tiwari,  
r/o Village – Pandari (Pura Pura), Tehsil – Gauriganj, District –  
Amethi (UP).

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri Parijaat Belaura**, Advocate.  
Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
2. Chief of Army Staff, Integrated Head Quarters, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi.
3. Officer-in-Charge, Corps of Military Police Records, PIN 900493, C/o 56 APO.
4. The Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad (UP).

.....**Respondents**Ld. Counsel for the : **Dr. S.N. Pandey**,  
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.

- (I) *To set aside the Injury report dated 10 Aug 2009.*
- (II) *To set aside order dated 08.03.2018 (Anx I)*
- (III) *To grant disability Pension @50% and round of the same to 75% giving the benefit of Govt. of India, Min. of Def. Letter dated 31.01.2001, w.e.f. date of discharge of applicant i.e. 29.02.2016.*
- (IV) *To pay arrear of disability pension along with 12% interest from the date of his discharge i.e. 01.03.2016 till it is actually paid.*
- (V) *Any other suitable relief this Hon’ble Court deems fit and proper may also be granted.*

2. Briefly stated facts of the case are that applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 28.02.1994 and was discharged on 29.02.2016 in Low Medical Category on completion of service limits under Rule 13 (3) Item III (i) of the Army Rules, 1954. At the time of retirement from service, the Release Medical Board (RMB) held at Military Hospital, Bareilly on 19.10.2015 assessed his disabilities (i) **‘OBESITY (E-66) @5% for life,** (ii) **‘TYPE II DIABETES MELLITUS (E-11)’@20% for life,** (iii) **‘DYSLIPIDEMIA (E-78.0)’ @5% for life and (iv) ‘ACL TEAR COMPLETE (RT) OPTD (S-83.5)’ @ 20% for life,** composite @40% for life and opined the disabilities to be neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by

service. The applicant approached the respondents for grant of disability pension but the same was rejected vide letter dated 08.03.2018. 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 Army and there is no note in the service documents that he was suffering from any disease at the time of enrolment in Army. The diseases of the applicant was contacted during the service, hence they are attributable to and aggravated by Military Service. He pleaded that various Benches of Armed Forces Tribunal have granted disability pension in similar cases, as such the applicant be granted disability pension as well as arrears thereof, as such the applicant is entitled to disability pension and its rounding off to 50%.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that composite disabilities of the applicant @40% for life have been regarded as NANA by the RMB, hence applicant is not entitled to 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. The questions which needs to be answered are of two fold :-

- (a) Whether the disabilities of the applicant are attributable to or aggravated by Military Service?
- (b) Whether the applicant is entitled for the benefit of rounding off the 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 disabilities (i) '**OBESITY (E-66)**', (ii) '**TYPE II DIABETES MELLITUS (E-11)**' and (iii) '**DYSLIPIDEMIA (E-78.0)**' are neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground of that they are life style disease and for fourth disability i.e. '**ACL TEAR COMPLETE (RT) OPTD (S-83.5)**' on the ground of injury report, therefore, applicant is not entitled to disability pension. We are of the opinion that these reasoning of Release Medical Board for denying disability pension to applicant is not convincing and doesn't reflect the complete truth on the matter. The applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 28.02.1994 and the disabilities Nos.

(i), (ii) and (iii) have started after more than 20 years of Army service i.e. in the year 2014. 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 vs Union of India & Ors*** (supra) and the first, second and third disabilities of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by military service.

8. Further, with regard to fourth disability i.e. '**ACL TEAR COMPLETE (RT) OPTD (S-83.5)**' we find that the RMB has regarded this disability as NANA on the basis of injury report dated 09.06.2008. We find that when applicant sustained injury resulting into this disability i.e. '**ACL TEAR COMPLETE (RT) OPTD (S-83.5)**', he was on Preparatory Leave from 28.05.2008 to 31.05.2008 on permanent posting from Western Command Provost Unit to 23 Infantry Division Provost Unit and on 31.05.2008 going from his village to Railway Station for onward journey to Duty Station 23 Infantry Division Provost Unit by his Motor Cycle as per settled legal position, casual leave as well as annual leave are treated as duty.

9. The respondents have denied disability pension to the applicant on the reason that for getting disability pension, in respect of injury sustained during the course of employment, there must be some causal connection between the disability and military service, and this being lacking in applicant's case, as there was no causal

connection between this disability and military service, he is not entitled for the same.

10. This question has been considered time and again not only by the various Benches of Armed Forces Tribunal but by the Hon'ble High Courts and the Hon'ble Apex Court. In a more or less similar matter, **Secretary, Govt of India & Others Vs. Dharamveer Singh**, decided on 20 September 2019, in Civil Appeal No 4981 of 2012, the facts of the case were that respondent of that case met with an accident during the leave period, while riding a scooter and suffered head injury with **'Faciomaxillary and Compound Fracture 1/3 Femur (LT)'**. A Court of enquiry was conducted in that matter to investigate into the circumstances under which the respondent sustained injuries. The Brigade Commander gave Report, dated August 18, 1999 to the effect that injuries, occurred in peace area, were attributable to military service. One of the findings of the report recorded under Column 3 (c) was that "No one was to be blamed for the accident. In fact respondent lost control of his own scooter". In this case the respondent was discharged from service after rendering pensionable service of 17 years and 225 days. In pursuance to report of the Medical Board dated November 29, 1999, which held his disability to be 30%, the claim for disability pension was rejected by the Medical Board on the ground that the disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service. An appeal

filed by the respondent against the rejection of his claim for the disability pension was rejected by the Additional Directorate General, Personnel Services. Respondent then filed an O.A. in Armed Forces Tribunal against the order of denial of disability pension which after relying upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Madan Singh Shekhawat v. Union of India & Ors***, (1999) 6 SSC 459 was allowed by the Tribunal holding that respondent was entitled to disability pension. Aggrieved by the same, this Civil Appeal was filed in which the Hon'ble Apex Court framed following 3 points for consideration:-

- (a) Whether, when Armed Forces Personnel proceeds on casual leave or annual leave or leave of any kind, he is to be treated on duty?.
- (b) Whether the injury or death caused if any, the armed forces personnel is on duty, has to have some causal connection with military service so as to hold that such injury or death is either attributable to or aggravated by military service?.
- (c) What is the effect and purpose of Court of Inquiry into an injury suffered by armed forces personnel?.

11. The Hon'ble Apex Court decided the question number 1 in affirmative holding that when armed forces personnel is availing casual leave or annual leave, is to be treated on duty.



12. While deciding the second question the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 20 of the judgment held as under:-

“ In view of Regulations 423 clauses (a) , (b), there has to be causal connection between the injury or death caused by the military service. The determining factor is a causal connection between the accident and the military duties. The injury be connected with military service howsoever remote it may be. The injury or death must be connected with military service. The injury or death must be intervention of armed forces service and not an accident which could be attributed to risk common to human being. When a person is going on a scooter to purchase house hold articles, such activity, even remotely, has no causal connection with the military service”.

13. Regarding question number 3, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that if a causal connection has not been found between the disabilities and military service, applicant would not be entitled to the disability pension. While deciding this issue, the Hon'ble Apex Court has discussed several cases decided by itself as well as the various Benches of the Armed Forces Tribunal and the High Courts and has held that when armed forces personnel suffers injury while returning from or going to leave, it shall be treated to have causal connection with military service and, for such injury, resulting in disability, the injury would be considered attributable to or aggravated by military service.

14. The Hon'ble Apex Court while summing up took note of following guiding factors by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh, in the case of **Jagtar Singh v. Union of India & Ors**, Decided on November 02, 2020 in TA No 61 of 2010

approved in the case of **Sukhwant Singh** and **Vijay Kumar** case, and held that they do not warrant any modification and the claim of disability pension is required to be dealt with accordingly. Those guiding factors are reproduced below for reference:-

*“(a) The mere fact of a person being on 'duty' or otherwise, at the place of posting or on leave, is not the sole criteria for deciding attributability of disability/death. There has to be a relevant and reasonable causal connection, howsoever remote, between the incident resulting in such disability/death and military service for it to be attributable. This conditionality applies even when a person is posted and present in his unit. It should similarly apply when he is on leave; notwithstanding both being considered as 'duty'.*

*(b) If the injury suffered by the member of the Armed Force is the result of an act alien to the sphere of military service or in no way be connected to his being on duty as understood in the sense contemplated by Rule 12 of the Entitlement Rules 1982, it would not be legislative intention or nor to our mind would be permissible approach to generalise the statement that every injury suffered during such period of leave would necessarily be attributable.*

*(c) The act, omission or commission which results in injury to the member of the force and consequent disability or fatality must relate to military service in some manner or the other, in other words, the act must flow as a matter of necessity from military service.*

*(d) A person doing some act at home, which even remotely does not fall within the scope of his duties and functions as a Member of Force, nor is remotely connected with the functions of military service, cannot be termed as injury or disability attributable to military service. An accident or injury suffered by a member of the Armed Force must have some 23 T.A. No. 61 of 2010 decided on November 2, 2010 by the Tribunal casual connection with military service and at least should arise from such activity of the member of the force as he is expected to maintain or do in his day-to-day life as a member of the force.*

*(e) The hazards of Army service cannot be stretched to the extent of unlawful and entirely un-connected acts or omissions on the part of the member of the force even*

*when he is on leave. A fine line of distinction has to be drawn between the matters connected, aggravated or attributable to military service, and the matter entirely alien to such service. What falls ex-facie in the domain of an entirely private act cannot be treated as legitimate basis for claiming the relief under these provisions. At best, the member of the force can claim disability pension if he suffers disability from an injury while on casual leave even if it arises from some negligence or misconduct on the part of the member of the force, so far it has some connection and nexus to the nature of the force. At least remote attributability to service would be the condition precedent to claim under Rules 173. The act of omission and commission on the part of the member of the force must satisfy the test of prudence, reasonableness and expected standards of behavior”.*

(f) The disability should not be the result of an accident which could be attributed to risk common to human existence in modern conditions in India, unless such risk is enhanced in kind or degree by nature, conditions, obligations or incidents of military service.”

15. We have considered the applicant’s case in view of above guiding factors and we find that applicant suffers injury on 31.05.2008 while going to join on permanent posting to 23 Infantry Divison Provost Unit, hence, it shall be treated to have causal connection with military service and, for such injury, resulting in fourth disability i.e. ‘**ACL TEAR COMPLETE (RT) OPTD (S-83.5)**’, the injury shall be considered attributable to or aggravated by military service

16. 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 10<sup>th</sup> 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 invalidated 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.”*

17. As such, in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above cases, we are of the considered view that benefit of rounding off of disability pension @ 40% for life to be rounded off to 50% for life may be extended to the applicant from the date of his discharge i.e. 29.02.2016.

18. In view of the above, the Original Application No. 14 of 2019 deserves to be allowed, hence **allowed**. The impugned order dated 08.03.2018, annexed at page 24 of Original Application, is set aside. The disabilities of the applicant are held as aggravated by Army Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @40% for life which would be rounded off to 50% from the date of his discharge. The respondents are directed to grant disability element to the applicant @40% for life which would stand rounded off to 50% for life from the date of discharge. The respondents are 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 @ 9% per annum till actual payment

19. No order as to costs.

(Vice Admiral Raghunath Karve)  
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)  
Member (J)

Dated : 09 December, 2020

AKD/-