

RESERVED
Court No. 1

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 459 of 2017

Friday, this the 29th day of March, 2019

“Hon’ble Mr. Justice S.V.S. Rathore, Member (J)
Hon’ble Air Marshal B.B.P. Sinha, Member (A)”

K.K. Pandey, No. 6926346H, Hav (SKT/GS&C), son of Shri Ramashray Pandey, Resident of Village & Post Office – Sevta, District Azamgarh, U.P.

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the : **Shri V.K. Pandey**, Advocate.
Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, South Block, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110011.
2. Director, PS-4, AG’s Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army), DHQ PO, New Delhi-110011.
3. OIC, AOC Records, PIN-900453, C/o 56 APO.
4. Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad (U.P.).

.....**Respondents**

Ld. Counsel for the : **Dr. Shailendra Sharma Atal**,
Respondents. Central Govt. Counsel

ORDER**“Per Hon’ble Air Marshal B.B.P. Sinha, Member (A)”**

1. The instant Original Application has been filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for the following reliefs.

- “(i) That this Hon’ble Tribunal may kindly be pleased to quash the impugned order dated 12.05.2008, whereby the Disability Pension Element of the applicant was rejected by the opposite party no. 3, as contained in annexure no. 1, to this original application.*
- “(ii) That this Hon’ble Tribunal may kindly be pleased to direct the opposite parties to pay the Disability Pension Element by rounding off each disability as 50% and in aggregate hold the applicant entitled for 100% from 28.09.2007 to actual date of payment and also onwards, and provide the interest on the aforesaid delayed amount of disability pension with 18% p.a. since due date to actual date of payment.*
- “(iii) That this Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to pass any other order or direction which this Hon’ble Court may deem just and proper be passed in favour of the applicant.*
- “(iv) That this Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to award the cost of this original application and legal expenses Rs.50,000/- (fifty thousand) and allow the same.”*

2. Briefly stated facts of the case are that the applicant was enrolled in Army Ordnance Corps in the Indian Army on 27.11.1986 and was discharged on 31.12.2007 (Afternoon) in Low Medical Category S₁H₁A₁P₃E₁ on fulfilling the conditions of his enrolment. At the time of retirement from service, the Release

Medical Board (RMB) held at 151 Base Hospital, C/o 99 APO on 28.09.2007 assessed his disabilities '(i) **PRIMARY HYPERTENSION I-10 @30% for life and (ii) NIDDM E-11 @30% for life**' composite 60% for life and opined the disabilities to be neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service (Reason for first disability 'onset in peace area' and for second disability 'A Constitutional disorder not related to service'). The applicant preferred representation before the respondents for grant of disability pension and its rounding off which was rejected vide order dated 12.05.2008. 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 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 pension as well as arrears thereof, as such the applicant is entitled to disability pension and its rounding off to 75%.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that both disabilities of the applicant @30% each for life,

(composite 60% for life) have been regarded as NANA by the RMB, hence 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. The questions which needs to be answered are of two fold :-

- (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 of his 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 disabilities '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION I-10 and NIDDM E-11**' are neither attributable to nor aggravated

(NANA) by service as the onset of first disability was in peace area and for second disability is NANA because it is 'a Constitutional disorder not related to service'. This reasoning of RMB is not totally convincing and doesn't reflect the complete truth on this matter. The applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 27.11.1986 and the disabilities have started after more than 19 years of Army service i.e. in the year 2006 and 2007 respectively. Considering all issues we are of the considered opinion that the reason given for making '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION I-10**' as NANA is not logical and doesn't meet the ends of justice. Military personnel at peace stations have their own pressures of training and other military related stress and strains. Therefore, 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 disability of the applicant '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION I-10**' @30% for life should be considered as aggravated by military service. We however agree with the opinion of RMB and accept the second disability i.e. '**NIDDM E-11**' as NANA.

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 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.”

9. It is also observed that claim for pension is based on continuing wrong and relief can be granted if such continuing

wrong creates a continuing source of injury. In the case of **Shiv Dass vs. Union of India**, reported in 2007 (3) SLR 445, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed:

“In the case of pension the cause of action actually continues from month to month. That, however, cannot be a ground to overlook delay in filing the petition. It would depend upon the fact of each case. If petition is filed beyond a reasonable period say three years normally the Court would reject the same or restrict the relief which could be granted to a reasonable period of about three years. The High Court did not examine whether on merit appellant had a case. If on merits it would have found that there was no scope for interference, it would have dismissed the writ petition on that score alone.”

10. As such, in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Shiv Dass (supra)**, we are of the considered view that benefit of rounding off of disability pension @30% for life to be rounded off to 50% for life may be extended to the applicant from three preceding years from the date of filing of the Original Application.

11. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 459 of 2017** deserves to be partly allowed, hence **partly allowed**. The disability '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION I-10**' @30% for life of the applicant is to be considered as aggravated by military service. The respondents are directed to grant disability element of pension to the applicant @30% for life which would stand rounded off to 50% for life w.e.f. three years preceding the date of filing this Original Application. The date of filing this O.A. is 04.10.2016. The

respondents are 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 @ 9% per annum till actual payment.

No order as to costs.

(Air Marshal B.B.P. Sinha)
Member (A)

(Justice S.V.S. Rathore)
Member (J)

Dated: March, 2019
AKD/-