

**Court No. 1****ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 523 of 2024**Monday, this the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 2024**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)  
Hon’ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)”**

No. 14667142X Nk Satya Prakash Dhiman (Retd)  
 S/o Sevaram Dhiman  
 R/o Vill – Gandharona,  
 Post Office – Landhaura,  
 Tehsil – Roorkee,  
 Distt – Haridwar, Uttarakhand - 247664

**..... Applicant**

Counsel for the : **Shri Sarvesh Kumar Verma**, Advocate  
 Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, New Delhi – 110011.
2. The Chief of the Army Staff, IHQ of MoD (Army), South Block, New Delhi – 110010.
3. The Additional Directorate General PS-4, Adjutant General Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army), New Delhi – 110011.
4. The Officer-in-Charge, EME Records, PIN-900453, C/o 56 APO.
5. The Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension), Draupadi Ghat, Prayagraj-211014.

**.....Respondents**

Counsel for the : **Shri S.K. Pandey**, Advocate  
 Respondents. Central Govt. 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 :-

- (I) To quash the impugned order passed by respondent No. 4, i.e. Records EME order dated 16.09.2022 and 27.04.2023 is being annexed as Annexure No.1A & 2A to this Original Application.
- (II) To quash the impugned order passed by Respondent No. 3, i.e. ADPS order date PS-4 (ACFA) dated 29.03.2023 is being annexed as Annexure No. 3A to this Original Application.
- (III) To quash the impugned order passed by Respondent No. 5 i.e. PCDA (P) to SPARSH 204202203609 is being annexed as Annexure No. 4A to this Original Application.
- (IV) To grant the disability pension @ 30% for life and round off to 50% giving the benefit of Govt. of India, Ministry of Defence letter dated 31.01.2001 from the next date of retirement i.e. 01.11.2022, because date of discharge of applicant is 31.10.2022.
- (V) To pay the arrear of disability pension along with interest at 12% wef 01.11.2022 till it is actually paid.
- (VI) To award any other relief as considered by the Hon’ble Tribunal deemed appropriate in favour of the applicant.
- (VII) To allow this OA with cost.”

2. Facts giving rise to Original Application in brief are that applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 10.01.2004 and was discharged from service on 31.10.2022 (AN) in low medical category under Rule 13 (3) Item III (iii) (a) (i) of Army Rules, 1954 being

unwilling to continue in service. On 05.05.2012 applicant sustained injury while he was performing domestic household work during casual leave from 23.04.2012 to 06.05.2012, which after investigation was found to be a case of “**FRACTURE CALCANEUM (LT)**”. Before being discharged from service, Release Medical Board (RMB) was held at MH Ambala Cantt on 11.08.2022 in which applicant was found suffering with 30% disability for life and attributable to military service. The applicant was issued PPO dated 14.10.2022 granting service pension. Despite being discharged from service in low medical category, disability pension was denied to applicant on the reason that his disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service which was communicated to the applicant vide letter dated 16.09.2022. The first appeal of the applicant was also rejected vide order dated 27.04.2023. It is in this perspective that the applicant has preferred the present Original Application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant sustained injury while performing the household job, i.e. fixing a photo frame of his military attire while on casual leave. The RMB of the applicant held on 11.08.2022 and assessed his disability, “**FRACTURE CALCANEUM (LT)**” @ 30% for life as attributable to military service. The applicant was eligible for service pension but was granted Invalid pension against the laid down rules as per Para 47 of the Pension Regulations for the Army, 2008 (Part-1) and was denied disability pension as per communication order dated 16.09.2022 and

SPARSH PPO dated 27.07.2023. 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 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 as held in the case of **Dharamvir Singh vs. Union of India & Others** (2013) 7 SCC 316, and also as per Rule 5, 9 & 14 of the Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982. He also placed reliance on the judgment of the AFT (RB) Chennai in OA 120 of 2015, **Ex Sgt Trilochan Behara vs. union of India and Others**, decided on 02.09.2016. Since the disability of the applicant was considered attributable to military service and assessed @ 30% for life, applicant is entitled to 50% disability pension for life duly rounded off in terms of Govt. of India letter dated 31.01.2001.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the applicant got injured while on casual leave w.e.f. 23.04.2012 to 06.06.05.2012. The applicant sustained injury "**FRACTURE CALCANEUM (LT)**" while performing domestic household work while on casual leave. A Court of Inquiry was held and injury was considered attributable to military service. The RMB assessed disability of the applicant @ 30% for life as attributable to military service. 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 was not reported/detected while being enrolled or commissioned. He further submitted that in the given facts, applicant sustained injured “**FRACTURE CALCANEUM (LT)**” while performing domestic household work during casual leave, there was no causal connection between the injury sustained and military service and, therefore, applicant is not entitled to disability pension, as he is claiming as laid down in para 6, 9 and 10 of the Entitlement Rules for Casualty pensionary Awards, 2008. 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 Sarveh Kumar Verma, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri D.K. Pandey, 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 was enrolled in the Army on 10.01.2004 and discharged from service on 31.10.2022 (AN), he sustained injury 'Fracture Calcaneum' during casual leave while performing domestic household work and placed in low medical category. The Release Medical Board held on 11.08.2022 and his disability was assessed at 30% for life as attributable to military service but the disability pension claim of the applicant was rejected by the respondents.

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 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 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 case in view of above guiding factors and we find that applicant sustained injury, '**Fracture Calcaneum**' while performing domestic household work while on casual leave which resulted disability @ 30% for life as attributable to military service. The activity in which he 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.

**(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)**  
**Member (A)**

Dated: 02 December, 2024  
SB

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