

Court No. 1**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 1082 of 2023**Friday, this the 22nd day of March, 2024**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)”****“Hon’ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)”**

No. 14835195-M, Ex. Hav. Shailesh Kumar Ray S/o Shri Bali Ram Singh, R/o C/o Dinesh Kumar Prajapati, Plot No. 19, Gaurabag, Kursi Road, Lucknow, (U.P), Pin – 226026.

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Ravi Kumar Yadav**, Advocate.
Shri Saurabh Yadav, Advocate

Versus

1. The Union of India, Rep. by the Secretary, Govt. of India, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi -110011.
2. The Chief of the Army Staff, Integrated Headquarters of MoD(Army), Post – DHQ, New Delhi-110011.
3. Addl. Dte. Gen Personnel Service, Adjutant General’s Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army), ‘A’ Wing, Room No. 435, 4th Floor, Sena Bhawan, DHQ PO, New Delhi -110011.
4. The Officer –in-Charge, ASC Records (South), Pin -900493, C/o 56 APO.
5. PCDA(Pension), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad (U.P) -211014.

.....Respondents

Ld. Counsel for the Respondents. : **Shri R.C. Shukla**, Advocate
Central Govt. Standing Counsel
Assisted by Major Uma Yadav,
Departmental Representative.

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 :-

- A. *To quash and set aside the Respondent No.4 letter No. 14835195M/NS/DP dated 10 Jul 2018 and Respondent No. 3 letter No. B/405021/13/2019/AG/PS-4 (Imp-II) dated 18 Jul 2019 (Annexure A-1& A-2 of Instant Order).*
- B. *To issue /pass an order or directions of appropriate nature to the respondents to grant disability element to the applicant from the date of his retirement from service (01.08.2018) and to pay the arrears along with suitable rate of interest as deem fit by this Hon’ble Tribunal.*
- C. *To consider composite disablement for disability (i) &(ii) @70% and grant the benefit of rounding off of the disability element from 70% to 75% for life in terms of Govt. of India letter dated 31 Jan 2001 and to pay the arrears along with suitable rate of interest as deem fit by this Hon’ble Tribunal.*
- D. *Any other relief as considered proper by the Hon’ble Tribunal awarded in favour of the applicant.*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 03.07.2001 and discharged on 31.07.2018 (AN) in Low Medical Category on fulfilling the conditions of his enrolment under Rule 13 (3) Item III (i) of the Army Rules, 1954. At the time of discharge from service, the Release Medical Board (RMB) held at Base Hospital on 16.03.2018 assessed his

disabilities (i) '**PANIC DISORDER (F 41.0)**', @40% life (ii) '**HYPERTENSION (I-10)**' @ 30% for life, (iii) '**HYPERURICEMIA (E-79.0)**' @1-5%for life and (iv) '**OBESITY (E66)**' @1-5% for life **composite disabilities @ 60% 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 10.07.2018. The applicant preferred First Appeal which too was rejected vide letter dated 18.06.2019 which was communicated to the applicant vide letter dated 10.07.2019. The applicant preferred Second Appeal dated 22.08.2022 but of no avail. 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 element of disability pension in similar cases, as such the applicant be granted 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 @ 60% for life have been regarded

as NANA by the RMB, hence as per Regulation 53(a) of the Pension Regulations for the Army, 2008 (Part-I) which provides that “*An individual released/retired/ discharged on completion of terms of engagement or on completion of service limits or on attaining the prescribed age (irrespective of his period of engagement), if found suffering from a disability attributable to or aggravated by military service and so recorded by Release Medical Board, may be granted disability element in addition to service pension or service gratuity from the date of retirement/discharge, if the accepted degree of disability is assessed at 20% or more*” the 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 **PANIC DISORDER (F41.0)** and **'HYPERTENSION (I-10)** are neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground that first disability is a mental disorder not related to service condition and of onset of second on 06.01.2016 while posted in Peace location (Kanchrapara, West Bengal), 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 for the first and second disabilities 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. Although the first disability is a mental disorder but considering that the applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 03.07.2001 and the first and second disabilities have started after more than 14 years of Army service i.e. on 06.01.2016 we are of the 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 disabilities of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by military service.

8. However, with regard to third and fourth disabilities i.e. '**HYPERURICEMIA (E-79.0)**' and '**OBESITY (E66)**' we are agree with the opinion of the RMB as NANA as the third disability is a metabolic disorder and the fourth disability is a life style disease and they are not related to military service.

9. In para 17 A (a) of Chapter VII of the Guide to Medical Officer (Military Pensions), 2002 the provision for composite assessment has been mentioned which reads as under :-

"17A. Composite Assessment

(a) Where there are two or more disabilities due to service, compensation will be based on the composite assessment of the degree of disablement. Generally speaking, when separate disabilities have entirely different functional effects, the composite assessment will be the arithmetical sum of their separate assessment. But where the functional effects of the disabilities overlap, the composite assessment will be reduced in proportion to the degree of overlapping. There is a tendency for some Medical Boards to reduce the composite assessment in the former group of cases. This is not correct."

10. In the instant case there are functional effects of the first and second disabilities overlapping, as such composite assessment is to be reduced in proportion to the degree of overlapping. The degree of first disability is @40% and second disability is @30% for which we are of the

view that there is some overlapping. Accordingly, we hold that composite assessment of first and second disabilities is more than @50% for life.

11. 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 January 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 invalided 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."*

12. Additionally, consequent upon the issue of Government of India, Ministry of Defence letter No. 17(01)/2017(01)/D(Pen/Policy) dated 23.01.2018, Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pensions), Prayagraj has issued Circular No. 596 dated 09.02.2018 wherein it is provided that the cases where Armed Forces Pensioners who were retired/discharged voluntary or otherwise with disability and they were in receipt of Disability/War Injury Element as on 31.12.2015, their extent of disability/War Injury Element shall be re-computed in the manner given in the said Circular which is applicable with effect from 01.01.2016.

13. 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.”

14. As such, in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of ***Union of India and Ors vs Ram Avtar & ors (supra)*** and ***Shiv Dass (supra)*** 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 element of disability pension more than @50% for life to be rounded off to 75% for life may be extended to the applicant from three preceding years from the date of filing of the Original Application.

15. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 1082 of 2023** deserves to be partly allowed, hence **partly allowed**. The impugned orders, rejecting the applicant's claim for grant of disability element of disability pension for the first and second disabilities, are set aside. First and second disabilities of the applicant are held as aggravated by Army Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element more than @50% for life which would be rounded off to 75% for life w.e.f. three years preceding the date of filing of Original Application. The respondents are directed to grant disability element to the applicant more than @50% for life which would stand rounded off to 75% for life w.e.f. three years preceding the date of filing of Original Application. The date

of filing of Original Application is 05.09.2023. 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

16. No order as to costs.

17. Major Major Uma Yadav, 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 the case the plea is rejected.

(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain)
Member (A)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

Dated : 22 March, 2024

Ashok/AKD/-