Court No.1

Reserved Judgment

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Original Application No. 291 of 2015

Wednesday this the 22nd day of February, 2017

Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.P. Singh, Member (J)
Hon'ble Lt Gen Gyan Bhushan, Member (A)

Sep Hari Singh, No. 3179926P
Son of Sri Bharat Singh
Resident of Village & Post Office - Mehrora
District - Aligarh

…….. Applicant

By Legal Practitioner - Shri O.P. Kushwaha, Advocate

Versus

1. Union of India through its Secretary,
   Ministry of Defence, Government of India,
   South Block, New Delhi-110011.

2. Director of Pension, Adjutant General's Branch, AGPS-4 Corps, IHQ of MoD (Army), DHQ P.O. New Delhi.

3. Office of the PCDA (P), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad.

4. Officer In-charge Records, The JAT Regiment, Bareilly (U.P.)

…… Respondents

By Legal Practitioner - Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta,
Learned Counsel for the Central Government

ORDER

"Hon'ble Lt Gen Gyan Bhushan, Member (A)"

1. The instant Original Application has been filed on behalf of the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, whereby he has claimed the reliefs as under:-

"(i) Set aside the impugned orders dated 23 July 1993 passed by PCDA (P) Allahabad and order dated 18.03.1997 passed by the Government of India, Ministry of Defense respectively being patently illegal on the face of it by directing the respondents to grant the disability pension from the date of its accrual (i.e. the date of invalidment from Army service).

(ii) Pass/issue appropriate order or direction as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case in favour of the applicant.

(iii) Allow the instant O.A. with cost."

2. The factual matrix of the case is that the applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 14.08.1986 and was discharged from service on 20.07.1992 (afternoon) in low medical category **"EEE"** due to disability **"SCHIZOPHRENIA 295"**. The medical board considered his disability as aggravated by military service and assessed it as 60% for 02 years. The claim for the disability pension was rejected vide PCDA (P) Allahabad order dated nil June 1993, communicated vide order dated 23.07.1993 and his appeal dated 17.12.1994 was rejected vide order dated 18.03.1997. Aggrieved, the applicant has filed this Original Application. The delay in filing of Original Application has been condoned vide order dated 14.10.2015.

3. Heard Shri O.P. Kushwaha, Learned Counsel for the applicant, Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Learned Counsel for the respondents and perused the record.

4. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that at the time of enrollment, the applicant was considered medically and physically fit to join the Army. The disease has occurred to him due to stress and strain of the military service, as such, keeping in view the large number of judgments passed by the various Benches of Armed Forces Tribunal, his disability must be considered as attributable to and aggravated by military service and he should be granted disability pension. He also submitted that as per Paragraph 173 of Pension Regulations 1961 (Part 1), pension may be granted to an individual who is invalided from service on account of disability, which is attributable to or aggravated by military service and percentage of disablement is assessed as 20% or above. Ld. Counsel for the applicant submitted that since the Medical Board has considered his disability as **not attributable to but aggravated by military service** and percentage of disablement has been assessed as more than 20%, as such, the applicant is entitled for grant of disability pension. He also submitted that the applicant is entitled to benefit of rounding off as per policy letter dated 31.01.2001. He further submitted that in large number of similar cases, various Benches of the Armed Forces Tribunal have granted disability pension and also given the benefit of rounding off.

5. P**er contra**, Learned Counsel for the respondents submitted that as per policy applicant's disability pension claim was preferred to PCDA (Pension), Allahabad, for adjudication and was rightly rejected as per Paragraph 173 of Pension Regulations 1961 (Part-1), which clearly states that pension may be granted to an individual who is invalided from service on account of disability, which is attributable to or aggravated by military service and percentage of disablement is assessed as 20% or above. Medical Advisor

(Pension), by exercising his powers conferred upon him, has assessed the disability of the applicant as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service being the disease constitutional in nature and not related due to service condition and thus, the applicant has no case and his disability pension has rightly been denied by the competent authority vide order dated nil June 1993. However, subsequently Ld. Counsel for the respondents conceded that in consonance with various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court and Armed Forces Tribunals, the applicant is entitled to disability pension.

6. We have gone through the relevant rules and regulations on the issue on the question of attributability of disability to military service, we would like to refer to the judgment and order of Hon'ble The Apex Court in the case of **Dharamvir Singh Vs. Union of India and Ors** reported in **(2013) 7 Supreme Court Cases 316,** in which Hon'ble The Apex Court had observed the provisions of the Pension 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).

XXX XXX XXX

31. In the present case it is undisputed that no note of any disease has been recorded at the time of the appellant's acceptance for military service. The respondents have failed to bring on record any document to suggest that the appellant was under treatment for such a disease or by hereditary he is suffering from such disease. In the absence of any note in the service record at the time of acceptance of joining of appellant, it was incumbent on the part of the Medical Board to call for records and look into the same before

coming to an opinion that the disease could not have been detected on medical examination prior to the acceptance for military service, but nothing is on record to suggest that any such record was called for by the Medical Board or looked into it and no reasons have been recorded in writing to come to the conclusion that the disability is not due to military service. In fact, non-application of mind of Medical Board is apparent from clause (d) of Para 2 of the opinion of the Medical Board, which is as follows :-

> *"(d) In the case of a disability under (c) the Board should state what exactly in their opinion is the cause thereof.*
>
> ***YES***
>
> *Disability is not related to military service".*

XXX XXX XXX

33. In spite of the aforesaid provisions, the pension sanctioning authority failed to notice that the Medical Board had not given any reason in support of its opinion, particularly when there is no note of such disease or disability available in the service record of the appellant at the time of acceptance for military service. Without going through the aforesaid facts the Pension Sanctioning Authority mechanically passed the impugned order of rejection based on the report of the Medical Board. As per Rule 5 and 9 of the Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982, the appellant is entitled for presumption and benefit of presumption in his favour. In the absence of any evidence on record to show that the appellant was suffering from "Generalised Seizure (Epilepsy)" at the time of acceptance of his service, it will be presumed that the appellant was in sound physical and mental condition at the time of entering the service and deterioration in his health has taken place due to service.

XXX XXX XXX

35. In view of the finding as recorded above, we have no option but to set aside the impugned order passed by the Division Bench dated 31-7-2009 in Union of India v. Dharamvir Singh and uphold the decision of the learned Single Judge dated 20-5-2004.

The impugned order is set aside and accordingly the appeal is allowed. The respondents are directed to pay the appellant the benefit in terms of the order passed by the learned Single Judge in accordance with law within three months if not yet paid, else they shall be liable to pay interest as per the order passed by the learned Single Judge. No costs."

7. On the issue of grant of disability pension, we would also like to recall the judgment passed in the case of **Sukhvinder Singh Vs. Union of India,** reported in (2014) STPL (WEB) 468 SC, in para 9 of the judgment Hon'ble The Apex Court has held as under:-

"9. We are of the persuasion, therefore, that firstly, any disability not recorded at the time of recruitment must be presumed to have been caused subsequently and unless proved to the contrary to be a consequence of military service. The benefit of doubt is rightly extended in favour of the member of the Armed Forces; any other conclusion would be tantamount to granting a premium to the Recruitment Medical Board for their own negligence. Secondly, the morale of the Armed Forces requires absolute and undiluted protection and if an injury leads to loss of service without any recompense, this morale would be severely undermined……".

8. In the instant case, the applicant was enrolled in the army on 14.08.1986 and he was discharged in low medical category **'EEE'** on 20.07.1992 due to disability **"SCHIZOPHRENIA 295"**. The Medical Board considered his disability as **not attributable to but aggravated by military service** and assessed it as 60% for 02 years. Though the Medical Board had considered the disability as not attributable to but aggravated by military service, but Medical Advisor (Pension) has considered the disability as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service and rejected the claim for disability pension.

9. We observe that, sitting over the opinion of the Medical Board, Medical Advisor (Pension) has expressed opinion that the

disability was **neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service**. It is observed that the respondents have failed to notice that the Medical Board in support of the opinion has mentioned that the disability has occurred due to physical and mental stress and strain of service and has considered the disability as not attributable to but aggravated by military service, but Medical Advisor (Pension) has considered the disability as not attributable to nor aggravated by military service. In the cases of **Dharamvir Singh** (supra) and **Sukhvinder Singh** (supra), it has been clearly postulated that when there is no note of such disease or disability available in the service record of the applicant at the time of acceptance for Army service, it would be presumed that the applicant was in sound physical and mental condition at the time of entering the service and deterioration in his health has taken place due to service. In this case the Medical Board in their opinion on page 3 against column 1 i.e. '**Did the disability exist before entering service',** has mentioned **'NO'**.

10. Medical Board held in June 1992, has considered the disabilities as aggravated by military service but Medical Advisor (Pension) has considered the disabilities as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service. In this connection we recall the judgment of **Hon'ble the Punjab and Haryana High Court in Ex. Havildar Babu Singh Vs. Union of India and others, CWP No. 3296 of 2003, decided on 26.04.2006 in which after referring the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of Ex. Sapper Mohinder Singh Vs. Union of India in Civil Appeal No. 164 of 1993, decided on 14.01.1993,** wherein it has been observed that pension sanctioning authority cannot sit over the opinion of the judgment of the experts in the medical line without making any reference to a detailed or higher Medical Board which can be constituted under the relevant instructions and rules by the Director

General of Army Medical Corps. The observation made in the judgment being relevant, is quoted below:-

> *"From the above narrated facts and the stand taken by the parties before us, the controversy that falls for determination by us is in a very narrow compass viz. whether the Chief Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension) has any jurisdiction to sit over the opinion of the experts (Medical Board) while dealing with the case of grant of disability pension, in regard to the percentage of the disability pension, or not. In the present case, it is nowhere stated that the petitioner was subjected to any higher Medical Board before the Chief Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension) decided to decline the disability pension to the petitioner. We are unable to see as to how the accounts branch dealing with the pension can sit over the judgment of the experts in the medical line without making any reference to a detailed or higher Medical Board which can be constituted under the relevant instructions and rules by the Director General of Army Medical Core."*

11. On the issue of benefit of rounding off, we recall the decision of Hon'ble The Apex Court in the case of **Union of India and Ors v Ram Avtar & ors Civil Appeal No 418 of 2012 dated 10th December 2014** in which Hon'ble The Apex Court nodded in disapproval the policy of the Government of India in not granting the benefit of rounding off of disability pension to the personnel who have been invalided out of service on account of being in low medical category or who has retired on attaining the age of superannuation or completion of his tenure of engagement, if found to be suffering from some disability. Keeping the policy letter dated 31.01.2001 and judgement of **Ram Avtar & ors (**supra), we are of the view that the applicant is entitled to the benefit of rounding off.

12. On the issue of delay and payment of arrears, we recall the case of **Shiv Dass Vs Union of India reported in 2007 (3) SLR 445** wherein in Para 9 of the judgment, Hon'ble The Apex Court has observed:-

> *"9. In the case of the 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."

13. Since the Medical Board has assessed the disability as 60% for 2 years, we recall the case of **Veer Pal Singh vs. Ministry of Defence** reported in (2013) 8 SCC 83, the observations made by Hon'ble The Apex Court are as under :

"11. A recapitulation of the facts shows that at the time of enrolment in the army, the appellant was subjected to medical examination and the Recruiting Medical Officer found that he was fit in all respects. Item 25 of the certificate issued by the Recruiting Medical Officer is quite significant. Therein it is mentioned that speech of the appellant is normal and there is no evidence of mental backwardness or emotional instability. It is, thus, evident that the doctor who examined the appellant on 22.05.1972 did not find any disease or abnormality in the behaviour of the appellant. When the Psychiatrist Dr (Mrs) Lalitha Rao examined the appellant, she noted that he was quarrelsome, irritable and impulsive but he had improved with the treatment. The Invaliding Medical Board simply endorsed the observation made by Dr Rao that it was a case of "Schizophrenic reaction".

12. In Merriam Webster Dictionary "Schizophrenia" has been described as a psychotic disorder characterized by loss of contact with the environment, by noticeable deterioration in the level of functioning in everyday life, and by disintegration of personality expressed as disorder of feeling, thought (as in delusions), perception (as in hallucinations), and behavior – called also dementia praecox; schizophrenia is a chronic, severe, and disabling brain disorder that has affected people throughout history.

13. The National Institute of Mental Health, USA has described "schizophrenia" in the following words:

"Schizophrenia is a chronic, severe, and disabling brain disorder that has affected people throughout history. People with the disorder may hear voices other people don't hear. They may believe other people are reading their minds, controlling their thoughts, or plotting to harm them. This can terrify people with the illness and make them withdrawn or extremely agitated. People with schizophrenia may not make sense when they talk. They may sit for hours without moving or talking. Sometimes people with schizophrenia seem perfectly fine until they talk about what they are really thinking. Families and society are affected by schizophrenia too. Many people with schizophrenia have difficulty holding a job or caring for themselves, so they rely on others for help. Treatment helps relieve many symptoms of schizophrenia, but most people who have the disorder cope with symptoms throughout their lives. However, many people with schizophrenia can lead rewarding and meaningful lives in their communities".

17. Unfortunately, the Tribunal did not even bother to look into the contents of the certificate issued by the Invaliding Medical Board and mechanically observed that it cannot sit in appeal over the opinion of the Medical Board. If the learned members of the Tribunal had taken pains to study the standard medical dictionaries and medical literature like The Theory and Practice of Psychiatry by F.C. Redlich and Daniel X. Freedman, and Modi's Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology, then they would have definitely found that the observation made by Dr Lalitha Rao was substantially incompatible with the existing literature on the subject and the conclusion recorded by the Invaliding Medical Board that it was a case of schizophrenic reaction was not well founded and required a review in the context of the observation made by Dr Lalitha Rao herself that with the treatment the appellant had improved. In our considered view, having regard to the peculiar

facts of this case, the Tribunal should have ordered constitution of Review Medical Board for re-examination of the appellant.

18. In Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension) vs. S Balachandran Nair on which reliance has been placed by the Tribunal, this Court referred to Regulations 173 and 423 of the Pension Regulations and held that the definite opinion formed by the Medical Board that the disease suffered by the respondent was constitutional and was not attributable to military service was binding and the High Court was not justified in directing payment of disability pension to the respondent. The same view was reiterated in Ministry of Defence vs A.V. Damodaran. However, in neither of those cases, this court was called upon to consider a situation where the Medical Board had entirely relied upon an inchoate opinion expressed by the psychiatrist and no effort was made to consider the improvement made in the degree of illness after the treatment.

19. As a corollary to the above discussion, we hold that the impugned order as also the orders dated 14.07.2011 and 16.09.2011 passed by the Tribunal are legally unsustainable. In the result, the appeal is allowed. The orders passed by the Tribunal are set aside and the respondents are directed to refer the case to the Review Medical Board for reassessing the medical condition of the appellant and find out whether at the time of discharge from service he was suffering from a disease which made him unfit to continue in service and whether he would be entitled to disability pension."

14. Keeping in view the judgments of **Dharamvir Singh**, **Sukhvinder Singh** and **Mohinder Singh** (supra), we converge to the view that the impugned order passed by the respondents was not only unjust, illegal but was also not in conformity with rules, regulations and law; and the impugned order deserve to be set aside. The applicant is entitled to disability pension @ 60% for two years which needs to be rounded off to 75% as per policy letter dated 31.01.2001 and in terms of decision of Hon'ble The Apex Court in the case of **Ram Avtar** (supra). We are also of the view

that the applicant needs to be brought before Review Medical Board to reassess his medical condition for further entitlement of disability pension, if any.

15. Thus in the result, the **Original Application No. 291 of 2015** succeeds and is allowed. The impugned orders dated 23.07.1993 and 18.03.1997 passed by the respondents are set aside. The respondents are directed to grant disability pension to the applicant @ 60% for two years, which would stand rounded off to 75% in terms of policy letter dated 31.01.2001 and in terms of decision of Hon'ble The Apex Court in the case of **Ram Avtar** (supra). The respondents are also directed to pay arrears of disability pension along with 9% interest from three years prior to filing of the Original Application i.e. 20.08.2015 till the date of actual payment. The respondents are further directed to refer the applicant's case to Review Medical Board in terms of decision of Hon'ble The Apex Court in the case of **Veer Pal Singh** (supra) for reassessing the medical condition of the applicant for further entitlement of disability pension, if any. 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.

16. No order as to costs.

(Lt Gen Gyan Bhushan)
Member (A)

(Justice D.P. Singh)
Member (J)

Dated : Feb, 2017
SB