

**Court No. 1****ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 510 of 2021**Wednesday, this the 01<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2021**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)  
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**IC – 43250P Brig. Rajiv Narain Mathur (Retd.) S/o Shri (Late)  
Vishnu Narain Mathur, R/o Greater NOida, Gautam Budh Nagar.

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri S.G. Singh**, Advocate and  
Applicant **Shri Anand Yadav**, Advocate

Versus

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
2. Chief of Army Staff, Integrated Headquarters of the Ministry of Defence (Army), South Block, New Delhi-110011.
3. Additional Directorate General Personnel Services, Adjutant General’s Branch, Integrated Headquarters of the Ministry of Defence (Army), Plot No. 108 (West), Brassey Avenue, Church Road, New Delhi-110001.
4. Additional Directorate General MP (5 & 6), Integrated Headquarters of the Ministry of Defence (Army), West Block-III, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110066.
5. Adjutant General’s Branch, Integrated Headquarters of the Ministry of Defence (Army), Room No. 100, Block M, Brassey Avenue, Church Road, New Delhi-110001.

.....**Respondents**Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri Devesh Kumar Mishra**, 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) *Issue/Pass an order or direction of appropriate nature whereby commanding the respondents to produce the record in original and thereafter quash the impugned orders dated 15.09.2020, 06.11.2020 and 19.01.2021 whereby rejecting the claim of the applicant for disability pension annexed as Annexure No. A-1 (i), (ii) and (iii) respectively with the application.*
- (b) *Issue/Pass an order or direction of appropriate nature whereby commanding the respondents to grant the disability pension to the applicant forthwith.*
- (c) *Allow the application with all consequential benefits with exemplary cost.*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was commissioned in the Indian Army on 14.12.1985 and was retired on 30.09.2020 in Low Medical Category on attaining the age of superannuation. At the time of retirement from service, the Release Medical Board (RMB) held at AFC, New Delhi on 24.08.2020 assessed his disabilities (i) **‘PRIMARY HYPERTENSION (I10)’ @30% for life**, (ii) **‘DIABETES MELLITUS (E11.0)’ @20% for life** and (iii) **‘SIMPLE OBESITY TYPE II (E66.9)’ @05% 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 15.09.2020. The applicant preferred First Appeal and Second Appeal which too were rejected vide letters dated 06.11.2020 and 19.01.2021 respectively. 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 commission, 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 commission in Army. The diseases of the applicant were contracted during the service, hence they are attributable to and aggravated by Military 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 @ 46.80-50% 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 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 first and second disabilities '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION (I10)**' and '**DIABETES MELLITUS (E11.0)**' are neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground of onset of these disabilities in November, 2015 and May, 2018 respectively while posted in Peace locations (Mathura and Shillong), therefore, applicant is not entitled to disability element of 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 commissioned in Indian Army on 14.12.1985 and the first and second disabilities have started after more than 30 years of Army service i.e. in November, 2015 and May, 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 first and second disability of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by military service. However, with regard to third disability i.e. '**SIMPLE OBESITY TYPE – II (E66.9)**' we are agree with the opinion of the RMB as NANA as this is a lifestyle disorder.

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 @50% for life to be rounded off to 75% for life

may be extended to the applicant from the next date of his retirement.

10. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 510 of 2021** deserves to be allowed, hence **allowed**. The impugned orders, rejecting the applicant's claim for grant of disability element of disability element of disability pension, are set aside. The first and second disabilities of the applicant are held as aggravated by Army Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @50% for life which would be rounded off to 75% for life from the next date of his retirement. The respondents are directed to grant disability element to the applicant @50% for life which would stand rounded off to 75% for life from the next date of his retirement. 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)  
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)  
Member (J)

Dated : 01 December, 2021

AKD/-