

Court No. 1

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 969 of 2023

Wednesday, this the 10th day of January, 2024

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

No 15411997A Ex Nk (MACP Hav) Sahadev Tomar, S/o Shri Devendra, Resident of village & post-Bhaura Kalan, Distt-Muzaffarnagar, PIN-251319 (UP).

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri KP Datta**, Advocate.
Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through its Secretary, Integrated HQs of MoD (Army), New Delhi-110011.
2. The Additional Directorate Gen of Personnel Services, PS-8/AG’s Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army), Room No 527, 5th Floor, ‘A’ Block, Defence Office Complex, KG Marg, New Delhi-110011.
3. The Officer-in-Charge, Records AMC Lucknow, PIN-226002 (UP).
4. The PCDA (P), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad, PIN-211014 (UP).

.....Respondents

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

ORDER (Oral)

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 to set-aside/quash rejection order passed by IHQ of MoD (Army) letter No B/40502/632/2023/AG/PS-8 dated 27 Jun 2023, received vide Records AMC letter No 15411997A/Pen/DP/1st Appeal dated 13 Jul 2023.*
- B. *To issue/pass an order to grant composite disability element @ 46% with benefits of rounding off to 50% in light of judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court and Orders of Hon'ble Armed Forces Tribunal in similar cases from next date of discharge w.e.f. 01.02.2023.*
- C. *To issue/pass an order to grant arrears of disability element alongwith interest @ 18% p.a. on arrears from next date of discharge w.e.f. 01.02.2023.*
- D. *Any other order as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem just, fit and proper under the circumstances of the case in favour of the applicant.*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 10.01.2001 and discharged on 01.02.2023 (F/N) in Low Medical Category on fulfilling the conditions of his enrolment under Rule 13 (3) Item III (iii) (a) (i) of the Army Rules, 1954. At the time of discharge from service, the Release Medical Board (RMB) held at Military Hospital, Golconda in the month of July, 2022 assessed his disabilities (i) **'Primary Hypertension (ICD-110)'** @ 30% for life, (ii) **'Diabetes Mellitus (ICD-E66)'** @ 20% for life and (iii) **'Obesity (ICD-E-66)'** @ 5% for life and composite disability @ 46% for life in

respect of all disabilities 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 02.02.2023. 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 disease of the applicant was contracted during the service, hence it is 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 pension and its rounding off to 50%.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that disabilities of the applicant @ 46% for life has been regarded as NANA by the RMB, therefore under Regulation 53 (a) of Pension Regulations for the Army, 2008 (Part-I), the applicant is not entitled to disability element of 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. On perusal of record we find that the applicant is suffering from three disabilities i.e. (i) '**Primary Hypertension (ICD-110)**', (ii) '**Diabetes Mellitus (ICD-E66)**' and (iii) '**Obesity (ICD-E-66)**'. As per RMB applicant has been assessed first disability to be 30% for life, the second disability to be 20% for life and the third disability to be 5% for life and composite disability @ 46% for life. In our opinion, applicant is not entitled to disability element of pension for the disability 'Obesity (ICD No E 66)'. Therefore, we would like to find out whether the disabilities 'Primary Hypertension' and 'Diabetes Mellitus' @ 30% and 20% for life respectively are attributable to or aggravated by military service.

7. 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)."

8. 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 disabilities to be NANA by military service on the ground of onset of disability on 27.10.2019 while posted in Peace location (Chandigarh), therefore, applicant is not entitled to disability element of 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 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 10.01.2001 and the disabilities have started after more than 19 years of Army service i.e. in the year 2019. 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*** (supra), and the disabilities of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by military service.

9. 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 invalidated 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."*

10. 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*** as well as Government of India, Ministry of Defence letter No. 17(01)/2017 (01)/D (Pen/Policy) dated 23.01.2018, we are of the considered view that benefit of rounding off of disability pension @ 46% for life to be rounded off to 50% for life may be extended to the applicant from the next date of discharge.

11. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 969 of 2023** deserves to be allowed, hence **allowed**. The impugned order, rejecting the applicant's claim for grant of disability element of pension, is set aside. The disabilities (i) '**Primary Hypertension (ICD-110)**' and (ii) '**Diabetes Mellitus (ICD-E66)**' of the applicant

are held as aggravated by Army Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @ 46% for life which would be rounded off to 50% for life from the next date of his discharge i.e. 01.02.2023. The respondents are directed to grant disability element to the applicant @ 46% 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% p.a. till the actual payment

12. No order as to costs.

13. Miscellaneous application (s), pending if any, stand disposed off.

14. Departmental Representative for the respondents orally submitted to grant leave to appeal against the above order, which we have considered and no point of law of general public importance being involved in this case, the plea is rejected.

(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)
Member (A)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

Dated :10.01.2024
rathore