

Court No. 1**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 367 of 2023****Friday, this the .14th day of July, 2023****“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)”**

Ex MWO AK Prasad (Ser No. 683723-R)
 S/o Late Shri Chakradhar Prasad
 C/o Umesh Kumar Pandey
 Ganpati Nagar Colony, Shivraj Nagar Chhittupur (BHU)
 Varanasi – 221005

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Shiv Kant Pandey**, Advocate
Ms. Nisha Pandey, Advocate

Versus

1. Union of India, through Defence Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Govt. of India, South Block, New Delhi – 110010.
2. The Chief of Air Staff Air HQ Vayu Bhawan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi – 110106.
3. Deputy Controller Defence Account (Air Force) Subroto Park, New Delhi – 110010.
4. The Director of Air Veterans (AV-III Appeal), Air HQ, AFRO Building, Subroto Park, New Delhi 0 110010.
5. The Director, Directorate of Air Veterans, Air HQ, Subroto Park, New Delhi – 110010.

.....Respondents

Ld. Counsel for the Respondents : **Shri Sunil Sharma**, Advocate
 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 :-

- i. *This Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to set aside part VII of the RMB dated 19 Jul 21 (Annexure-1 to present OA) to the extent the denial of disability pension to applicant.*
- ii. *This Hon’bl eTribunal may be pleased to set asdie order no. / letter no. AIR hq/99798/1/683723/03/22/dav (dp/rmb) DATED 20 Aug 22 whereby disability pension has been denied to applicant (Annexure – 2 to present OA).*
- iii. *This Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to grant disability pension to applicnat for life @ 30% disability to be rounded off to 50% since 01 Apr 2022 and for life.*
- iv. *This Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to direct respondents to issue the PPO for disability to applicnat, granting disability pension to applicnat from 01 Apr 22 and for life @ 50% disability.*
- v. *This Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to direct respondents to pay the entire arrears to applicant which accrued 01.04.2022.*
- vi. *This Hon’ble Tribunal may grant any other and further relief to applicnat as it deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.*
- vii. *This Hon’ble Tribunal may award the cost of petition to applicant.”*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was enrolled in the Indian Air Force on 04.06.1983 and was discharged on 31.03.2022 in Low Medical Category on fulfilling the conditions of his enrolment. At the time of discharge from service, the Release Medical Board (RMB) held at Air Force Station, New Delhi on 19.07.2021 assessed his disabilities, (i) 'PRIMARY HYPERTENSION' @ 30% % for life and (ii) 'DYSLIPIDEMIA' @ 5% for life, composite assessment @ 30% 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 17.03.2022, communicated vide letter dated 20.05.2022. 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 Air Force and there is no note in the service documents that he was suffering from any disease at the time of enrolment in Air Force. The diseases of the applicant were contracted during the service, hence both the disabilities are attributable to and aggravated by Air Force Service. He placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Dharamvir Singh vs. Union of India & Others**, 2013 STPL (Web) 498 SC and 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 Composite @ 30% for life has been regarded as NANA by the RMB, hence, under the provisions of Rule 153 of Pension Regulations for Air Force, 1961 (Part-1), the applicant is not entitled to 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 Air Force 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 disability 'Primary Hypertension' is neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground of onset of disability in 2007 while posted in Peace location, 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 pension to applicant is not convincing and doesn't reflect the complete truth on the matter. Peace Stations have their own pressure of rigorous Air Force training and associated stress and strain of Air Force service. The applicant was enrolled in Indian Air Force on 04.06.1983 and the disability 'Primary Hypertension' has started after more than 24 years of Air Force service i.e. in the year 2007. 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 first disability (Primary Hypertension) of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by Air Force service. However, with regard to second disability i.e. '**DYSLIPIDEMIA**', we are agree with the opinion of the RMB considering it as NANA as it is a metabolic disease with inherited enzyme deficiency and excessive intake of saturated fats with no causal connection to service.

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 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.”

9. As such, in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Ram Avtar (supra)**, we are of the considered view that benefit of rounding off of disability element of pension for the first disability (Primary Hypertension) @ 30% for life to be rounded off to 50% for life may be extended to the applicant from next date of discharge from service.

10. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 367 of 2023** deserves to be allowed, hence **allowed**. The impugned

orders dated 17.03.2022 and dated 20.05.2022, rejecting the applicant's claim for grant of disability element of disability pension, are set aside. The first disability (Primary Hypertension) of the applicant is held as aggravated by Air Force Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @ 30% for life which would be rounded off to 50% for life from the next date of his discharge from service. The respondents are directed to grant disability element to the applicant @30% for life which would stand rounded off to 50% for life from the next date of his discharge from service. 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.

12. Ld. Counsel 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 the case the plea is rejected.

(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

Dated : 14th July, 2023
SB