

**Court No. 1 (E. Court)****ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 440 of 2021**Friday, this the 07<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2022**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)  
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**

No. JC – 420629A Ex. Sub. Brij Bhan Singh, Son of Late Bacchu Singh, permanent address – Sector – B, Adarsh Nagar, Nilmatha, Lucknow-226002.

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi**, Advocate.

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence (Army), South Block, New Delhi-110010.
2. Chief of the Army Staff, IHQ of MOD (Army), Army HQ, South Block, New Delhi-110010.
3. Additional Director General, AG’s Branch, PS-4 (Imp-II), Integrated HQ of MoD (Army), DHQ-PO, Delhi-110011.
4. The Officer-in-Charge, Defence Security Corps Records, Mill Road, Burncerry – Post, Kannur, Kerala -6700013.
5. Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad.

.....**Respondents**Ld. Counsel for the Respondents. : **Ms. Kavita Mishra**, Advocate  
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 issue/pass an order or direction to Set aside/quash the rejection order dated 23.10.2018, which is annexed as Annexure No. 1 to this original application.*
- B. *To issue/pass an order or directions to the respondents for grant of disability element of disability pension from the date of discharge i.e. 31.10.2018 and rounding of disability pension upto 50% along with 12% interest of the arrear from the date of discharge i.e. 31.10.2018.*
- C. *To issue/pass any other order or direction as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem just, fit and proper under the circumstances of the case in favour of the applicant.*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was initially enrolled in the Mechanised Infantry Regiment of Indian Army on 26.02.1983 and was discharged on 28.02.2013 (AN) after rendering 30 years and 03 days of service under Rule 13(3) Item I (i)(a) of the Army Rules, 1954. The applicant re-enrolled in Defence Security Corps (DSC) on 26.10.2013 and discharged on 31.10.2018 in Low Medical Category under Rule 13 (3) Item I (i) of the Army Rules, 1954. At the time of discharge from DSC service, the Release Medical Board (RMB) held at Military Hospital, Agra on 09.05.2018 assessed his disability '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION (I.10)**' @ 30% for life and opined the disability to be neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service. The applicant's claim for grant of disability pension was rejected vide letter dated 23.10.2018. The applicant preferred Original Application No. 546 of 2019 before this

Tribunal which was disposed of vide order dated 27.01.2021 with direction to the respondents that in case applicant submits the representation/ appeal within 15 days the respondents shall decide the same by a speaking and reasoned order in accordance with law, rules and policy within a period of three months from the date of moving such representation and communicate the decision to the applicant. In compliance of order the applicant preferred First Appeal on 05.02.2021 but all in vain. 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/DSC and there is no note in the service documents that he was suffering from any disease at the time of enrolment in Army/DSC. The disease of the applicant was contacted during the service, hence it is attributable to and aggravated by Military/DSC Service. He pleaded that various Benches of Armed Forces Tribunal have granted disability element of disability pension in similar cases, as such the applicant be granted disability element of disability pension as well as arrears thereof, as applicant is also entitled to disability element of disability pension and its rounding off to 50%.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that disability of the applicant @30% for life has 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 and we find that the questions which need to be answered are of two folds:-

- (a) Whether the disability of the applicant is attributable to or aggravated by Military/DSC 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 disability '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION (I.10)**' is neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground of onset of disability on 13.09.2016 while posted in Peace

location (Lucknow), therefore, applicant is not entitled to 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 military training and associated stress and strain of military service. The applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 26.02.1983, re-enrolled in DSC on 26.10.2013 and the disability has started after more than 33 years of Army/DSC service i.e. on 13.09.2016. 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 disability of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by military/DSC 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 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 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. As such, in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India and Ors vs Ram Avtar & ors (supra)**, we are of the considered view that benefit of rounding off of disability pension @30% for life to be rounded off to 50% for life may be extended to the applicant from the next date of his discharge.

10. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 440 of 2021** deserves to be allowed, hence **allowed**. The impugned orders, rejecting the applicant's claim for grant of disability element of disability pension, are set aside. The disability of the applicant is held as aggravated by Army/DSC Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @30% for life which would be rounded off to 50% for life from the next date of his discharge. The respondents are directed to grant disability element to the applicant @30% for life which would stand rounded off to 50% for life from the next date of his discharge. 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

11. No order as to costs.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)  
Member (A) Member (J)

Dated : 07 January, 2022

AKD/-