

**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 552 of 2023**

Tuesday, this the 09<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2024

**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)  
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)”**

No. 13982406N Ex. L/Nk. Vipin Chandra Sharma, Son of Late Shanti Swarup Sharma, Village and Post Singhthara, Saydpur, Tehsil Bishauli, Police Station Wazirganj, District – Budaun (UP)-202525.

..... **Applicant**

Counsel for the : **Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi**, Advocate  
Applicant **Shri Anshuman Srivastava**, 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. The Officer-in-Charge Records, Record Office, ASC Records (South), Bangalore-560007.
4. The Appellate Committee on First Appeal (ACFA), Additional Director General of Personnel Services/PS-4 (Imp-II) AG’s Branch, Integrated HQ of MoD (Army), DHQ – PO, New Delhi-110011.
5. PCDA (Pension), Draupadi Ghat, Prayagraj (Allahabad).

.....**Respondent**

Counsel for the : **Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta**, Advocate  
Respondents. **Central Govt. Standing Counsel**

**ORDER**

**“Per Hon’ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, 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 directions to quash/set-aside the order no. 13982406/NS/DP dated 09.11.2009 and Appellate order no. 13982406/Apl/Pen/DP-II dated 11.12.2009 passed by Respondent No. 3 and 4 annexed as Annexure no. 1 and 2 to this original application.*
- (b) *To issue pass an order or directions to the respondents to grant Disability Element of Disability Pension @30% with effect from date of discharge i.e. 31.08.2008.*
- (c) *To issue pass an order or directions to respondents to grant benefit of Rounding off Disability Element of disability pension @30% to @50% for life to the applicant and pay due arrears including consequential benefits with interest @12% p.a. till final payment is made in light of Hon’ble Apex Court judgments and letter dated 31.01.2001.*
- (d) *Any other relief which the Hon’ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case is also granted along with cost of the OA.*

2. Facts giving rise to Original Application in brief are that applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 15.12.1990 and

discharged from service on 31.08.2008 (AN) being placed in medical category lower than SHAPE-1 and not upto the prescribed military physical standard under Rule 13(3) Item III (v) of Army Rules, 1954. The applicant was on twenty days Casual Leave from 13.07.2004 to 01.08.2004. During the aforesaid Casual Leave, on 24.07.2004 the applicant while going to meet his parent at Singhthra, District Budaun from Chandausi by his own Motor Cycle, sustained injury in his right leg, which after investigation was found to be a case of **“COMPOUND FRACTURE LOWER 1/3RD TIBIA FIBULA RT (OPTD)”**. Before being discharged from service, Release Medical Board (RMB) was held at Base Hospital, Delhi Cantt. on 12.06.2008 in which applicant was found suffering with 30% disability for life as attributable to service. Despite being discharged from service in low medical category, disability element of disability pension was denied to applicant on the reason that his disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service vide letter dated 09.11.2009. The applicant preferred First Appeal which too was rejected vide letter dated 24.06.2010 which was communicated to the applicant vide letter dated 26.07.2010. It is in this perspective that the applicant has preferred the present Original Application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant was on Casual Leave which is to be treated on duty when he sustained injury, which ultimately resulted into 30% disability for life, because of **“COMPOUND FRACTURE LOWER 1/3RD TIBIA FIBULA RT**

**(OPTD)**” and opined as attributable to service by the RMB. He submitted that the competent authority has no authority to overrule the opinion of the RMB. He further 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 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 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 element of disability pension.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the applicant was granted 20 days Casual Leave from 13.07.2004 to 01.08.2004. The applicant, during the aforesaid Casual Leave, sustained injury in his right leg while going to meet his parent at Singhthra, District Budaun from Chandausi by his own Motor Cycle. The Court of Inquiry opined that the injury sustained by the applicant is not attributable to military service which has also been agreed by the Officer Commanding, as the applicant was on Casual Leave. For grant of the disability element of 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 element of disability pension merely on the reason of being on duty or disability was not reported/detected while being enrolled or commissioned. He further submitted that in the given facts, applicant being injured on his right leg while going to Singhthra by his own motor cycle to meet his parent, there was no causal connection between the injury sustained and military service and, therefore, applicant is not entitled to disability element of disability pension, as he is claiming. In support, learned counsel for the respondents has placed reliance on the following case laws of the Hon'ble Apex Court:-

- (a) ***Renu Devi v Union of India and others***, Decided on July 03. 2019 in Special Appeal arising out of Diary No. C-37356 of 2017.
- (b) ***Vijay Kumar v. Union of India***, 2016 SCC 460.
- (c) The ***Secretary Govt of India & Others v. Dharamvir Singh*** Decided on 20, September 2019 in Civil Appeal No 4981 of 2012.

5. We have heard Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri Adesh Kumar Gupta, Ld. 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 was enrolled in the army on 15.12.1990 and discharged

from service on 31.08.2008, he sustained injury in his right leg while on Casual Leave due to accident while he was going to Singhthra by his own Motor Cycle to meet his parent and placed in low medical category for the disability "**COMPOUND FRACTURE LOWER 1/3RD TIBIA FIBULA RT (OPTD)**" vide Release Medical Board report dated 12.06.2008 and his disability was assessed at 30% for life as attributable to service, the disability claim of the applicant was rejected.

7. The respondents have denied disability element of 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 the disability and military service, he 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 duly?.

(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 case in view of above guiding factors and we find that applicant was on Casual Leave and while going to meet his parent at Singhthra, District Budaun from Chandausi by his own Motor Cycle sustained injury resulting into disability of to the extent of 30% for life, on account of **“COMPOUND FRACTURE LOWER 1/3RD TIBIA FIBULA RT (OPTD)”**. The Court of Inquiry has opined that the injury sustained by the applicant is not attributable to service which has been agree by the Officer Commanding. We also find that during Court of Inquiry, as Witness No. 1, in para 4, the applicant himself has admitted that *“On 24 Jul 2004 at 1100 h I was going to meet my parent at Singhthra, District : Bundaun by my Motor Cycle Regd no UP-24B-6710. Singhthra is 30 Kms away from Chandausi. At around 1145 h some 8 Kms from Chandausi near Bisauli there were fast wind blowing and raining, suddently a truck came from the opposite side in high speed. The road was narrow and broken and there was a small canal towards my side. I tried ot save from the speeding truck. On doing so, I fell down into the broken road and then to the canal. I was in conscious state.”*

14. In view of the above, we are of the opinion that the activity in which he sustained injury being not connected with his military duties in any manner, therefore, the applicant is not entitled to the disability element of disability pension for the same.

15. 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**.

16. No order as to cost.

**(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice Anil Kumar)**  
**Member (J)**

Dated: 09 April, 2024

AKD/-