

Court No. 1**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 420 of 2021**Thursday, this the 09th day of December, 2021**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**

JC – 843603L Sub. Rajiv Kumar (Discharged), S/o Shri (Late) S. Sharma, R/o Village – Tarwan, PO – Arap, Tehsil – Danapur, District – Patna (Bihar)-801104.

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh**, Advocate.
Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi-110011.
2. Chief of the Army Staff, Integrated Headquarters of MoD (Army), Post – DHQ, New Delhi-110011.
3. Addl. Dte. Gen. of Personnel Services/Adj. General’s Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army), PIN : 900258, C/o 58 APO.
4. Officer-in-Charge, Defence Security Corps Record, Pin-901277, C/o 58 APO.
5. PCDA (P) (Army, DSC), Draupadhi Ghat, Allahabad (UP)-212114.

.....**Respondents**Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri Ram Saran Awsthi**, Advocate
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 :-

- (A) *To quash or set aside the Respondent No. 3 letter dated 19 May 2020 (Annexure A-2 of OA) and Respondent No. 4 letter dated 11.07.2019 (Annexure A-3 of OA).*
- (B) *To issue order or directions to the respondents to grant disability element to the applicant with effect from 01.07.2019 (date of discharge) with all consequential benefits including rounding off benefit from 60% to 75% in terms of Government of India letter dated 31 Jan 2001 and Judgment passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in case of Ram Avatar Vs UOI & Others.*
- (C) *Any other relief as considered proper by the Hon'ble Tribunal be awarded in favour of the applicant.*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was initially enrolled in the SIKH Regiment of Indian Army on 27.11.1982 and was discharged on 31.03.1998 on his own request on compassionate grounds under Rule 13(3) Item III (iv) of the Army Rules, 1954. The applicant was re-enrolled in Defence Security Corps (DSC) on 23.02.1999 and was discharged on 30.06.2019 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, Kannur on 11.03.2019 assessed his disabilities (i) **'SIMPLE OBESITY (E66.9)'** @20% for life, (ii) **'HYPERTENSION (I10)'**@40% for life, (iii) **'PREDIABETES (R73.03)'** @20% for life and (iv) **'CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE – II (OBESITY RELATED GLOMERULOPATHY) (N18.9)'** @40% for life, **composite disabilities @60% for life** and opined the

disabilities to be neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service. The applicant's claim for grant of disability pension was rejected vide letter dated 11.07.2019. The applicant preferred First Appeal which too was rejected vide letter dated 19.05.2020. The applicant preferred Second Appeal dated 28.08.2020 but of no avail. 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 were contacted during the service, hence they are attributable to and aggravated by Military/DSC Service. He pleaded that various Benches of Armed Forces Tribunal have granted 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 75%.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that composite disabilities of the applicant @ 60% for life have been regarded as NANA by the RMB, hence applicant is not entitled to disability element of 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 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 second and third disabilities '**HYPERTENSION (I10)**' and '**PREDIABETES (R73.03)**' are neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground of onset of these disabilities in November, 2018 while posted in Peace location (Kannur, Kerala), 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 element of 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 27.11.1982, re-enrolled in DSC on 23.02.1999 and the second and third disabilities have started after more than 19 years of DSC service i.e. in November, 2018. 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 second and third disabilities of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by military service.

8. In para 17 A (a) of Chapter VII of the Guide to Medical Officer (Military Pensions), 2002 the provision for composite assessment has been mentioned which reads as under :-

“17A. Composite Assessment

(a) Where there are two or more disabilities due to service, compensation will be based on the composite assessment of the degree of disablement. Generally speaking, when separate disabilities have entirely different functional effects, the composite assessment will be the arithmetical sum of their separate assessment. But where the functional effects of the disabilities overlap, the composite assessment will be reduced in proportion to the degree of overlapping. There is a tendency for some Medical Boards to reduce the composite assessment in the former group of cases. This is not correct.”

9. In the instant case there are functional effects of the second and third disabilities overlapping, as such composite assessment is to be reduced in proportion to the degree of overlapping. The degree of second disability is @40% and third disability is @20% for which we are of the view that there is overlapping of 20%. Accordingly, we reduce it by 20% and we hold that composite assessment of second and third disabilities is @40% for life.

10. With regard to first and fourth disabilities i.e. '**SIMPLE OBESITY (E66.9)**' and '**CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE – II [OBESITY RELATED GLOMERULOPHATHY (N18.9)]**' we are agree with the opinion of RMB as NANA as first disease is a life style disorder and fourth disease is Obesity Related Glomerulopathy.

11. 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 10th 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.”

12. 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 element of disability pension @ 40 for life to be rounded off to 50% for life may be extended to the applicant from the next date of his discharge.

13. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 420 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 second and third disabilities of the applicant are held as aggravated by Army/DSC Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @40% 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 @40% 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

14. No order as to costs.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

Dated : 09 December, 2021

AKD/-