

**Court No. 1****ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 583 of 2021**Wednesday, this the 29<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava (J)  
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**

Smt. Rajeshwari, W/o Late Kashmir Singh No. 10405936X, Ex. Sep. (WM), R/o Village Nagla Tilok, P.O. Bara Keshav, P/S Nawabganj, District Farrukhabad (UP).

**..... Applicant**Counsel for the : **Shri Vijay Kumar Pandey, Advocate**  
Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, South Block, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110011.
2. OIC Records, 114 Inf. Bn. (TA) The Jat Regimental Centre, Bareilly-243001.
3. PCDA (P), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad (U.P.).

**.....Respondents**Counsel for the : **Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, Advocate**  
Respondents. Central Govt. Counsel**ORDER****“Per Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)”**

1. The instant Original Application has been filed by the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 with the following prayers:-

- (i) *That this Hon'ble Tribunal may kindly be pleased to direct the opposite parties to pay the disability pension for life to the applicant from 31.07.2009 to actual date of payment and also onwards, and provide the interest on the aforesaid delayed amount of disability pension with 18% p.a. since due date to actual date of payment.*
- (ii) *That this Hon'ble Tribunal may kindly be awarded the cost of Rs.20,20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Lac and Twenty Thousand only) to the applicant against the opposite parties.*
- (iii) *That this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to pass any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper be passed in favour of the applicant.*

2. During the pendency of Original Application the applicant's husband Ex. Sep./WM Kashmir Singh died on 04.02.2019, hence, the applicant has been substituted in his place. Facts giving rise to Original Application in brief are that applicant's husband was enrolled in Indian Army on 30.01.1996 and was discharged from service on 31.07.2009 in low medical category under Para 3 (c) of Army Order 460/73 and Rule 14 (b) (iii) of the Territorial Army Rules, 1948. On 21.05.2008 during the Casual Leave the applicant's husband free fall from a height of approx 15 feet while standing on a raised wooden platform made temporarily to assist the mason in construction of his house, which after investigation was found to be a case of **"ANTERIOR DISLOCATION (LT) SHOULDER WITH FRACTURE GREATER TUBEROSITY (LT) HUMERUS"**. Before being discharged from service, Release Medical Board was held at Military Hospital, Fatehgarh on 16.04.2009 in which applicant was found suffering with 20% disability for life. Despite being discharged in low medical

category, disability pension was denied to applicant's husband on the reason that his disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service vide letter dated 17.12.2009. The applicant's husband preferred First Appeal which too was rejected vide letter dated 24.12.2010. The applicant's husband preferred several representations but of no avail. It is in this perspective that the applicant has preferred the present Original Application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant's husband was on Casual Leave which is to be treated on duty when he sustained injury, which ultimately resulted into 20% disability for life, because of "**ANTERIOR DISLOCATION (LT) SHOULDER WITH FRACTURE GREATER TUBEROSITY (LT) HUMERUS**". He submitted that various Benches of AFT, Hon'ble High Courts and the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the matter of disability, has held that if an armed forces personnel suffers with disability/injury during the course of service, which was never reported earlier when he/she was enrolled/recruited in the army, the said disability would be treated to be attributable to or aggravated by military service and he/she shall be entitled to the disability pension for the same. Thus, he submitted that applicant's husband case being fully covered with above, as he also suffered injury while on duty and same being not reported earlier at the time of his enrolment, he is entitled to disability pension..

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that it is not disputed that when sustained injury resulting in disability,

as held in report dated 16.04.2009 of the Release Board Proceedings, applicant was on Casual Leave at his Home, although it is to be treated on duty. However, for grant of the disability pension it is not only required that armed Forces personnel should be on duty, but there must be some causal connection also between the injury and military service. He further submitted that unless injury sustained has causal connection with military service, armed forces personnel cannot be allowed disability pension merely on the reason of being on duty or disability/injury was not reported/detected while being enrolled or commissioned. He further submitted that in the given facts, applicant's husband being injured by free fall from a height of approx 15 feet while standing on a raised wooden platform made temporarily to assist the mason in construction of his house, there was no causal connection between the injury sustained and military service and, therefore, applicant's husband is not entitled to disability pension, as she is claiming.

5. We have heard Vijay Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant and Dr. Chet Narayan Singh, learned counsel for the respondents and have also perused the record.

6. After having heard the submissions of learned counsel of both sides we found that there are certain facts admitted to both the parties, i.e., applicant's husband was enrolled in the army on 30.01.1996 and discharged from service on 31.07.2009 (AN) in low medical category, he sustained injury/met with an accident during Casual Leave on

21.05.2008 by free fall from a height of approx 15 feet while standing on a raised wooden platform made temporarily to assist the mason in construction of his house and placed in low medical category for the disability “**ANTERIOR DISLOCATION (LT) SHOULDER WITH FRACTURE GREATER TUBEROSITY (LT) HUMERUS**” vide AFMSF-16 dated 16.04.2009 and his disability was assessed at 20% for life, the disability claim of the applicant was rejected accordingly. Learned counsel for the respondents has also conceded, during the course of hearing, that when applicant sustained injury resulting into disability, he was on Casual Leave although it may be treated on duty.

7. 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 husband case, as there was no causal connection between the disability and military service, applicant's husband is not entitled for the same.

8. This question has been considered time and again not only by the various Benches of AFT 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?.

9. 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.

10. 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”.

11. 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.

12. 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 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.”

13. We have considered the applicant’s husband case in view of above guiding factors and we find that applicant’s husband was on Casual Leave fallen from a height of approx 15 feet while standing on a raised wooden platform made temporarily to assist the mason in construction of his house and sustained injury resulting into disability of to the extent of 20% for life, on account of “**ANTERIOR DISLOCATION (LT) SHOULDER WITH FRACTURE GREATER TUBEROSITY (LT) HUMERUS**”. The activity in which the applicant’s husband sustained injury being not connected with his military duties in any manner, he is not entitled to the disability pension for the same.

14. In the result, we hold that the claim of applicant’s disability pension has rightly been rejected by the respondents which needs no interference. Resultantly, Original Application is **dismissed**.

15. No order as to cost.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)  
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)  
Member (J)

Dated: 29 September, 2021

AKD/-