

Court No. 2

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 1086 of 2023

Thursday, this the 2nd day of May, 2024

**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)
Hon’ble Maj Gen Sanjay Singh, Member (A)”**

No. JC-276307-H Ex Sub Gyaneshwar Pandey
S/o Brij Bhushan Pandey
R/o Vill & PO – Patkhauri, District – Azamgarh (UP)-276001

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Manoj Kumar Awasthi,**
Advocate

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Defence (Army), New Delhi – 110011.
2. The Chief of Army Staff, Army Headquarters, New Delhi-110011.
3. Addl. Dte Gen of Personal Services/PS-4, AG’s Branch, Integrated HQ of MoD (Army) Room No. 527, 5th Floor ‘A’ Block, DHQ PO, New Delhi – 110011.
4. Officer-in-Charge, Record Office, Artillery Records (Veteran Cell) PIN-908802, C/o 56 APO.
5. The PCDA (P) Draupadi Ghat, Prayagraj (UP) – 211014.

.....**Respondents**

Ld. Counsel for the Respondents : **Shri Devesh Mishra,**
Central Govt. Counsel

ORDER

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 or directions to the respondents to issue a fresh PPO for the restructured and revised, the applicant may please be granted increment preceding to his discharge as on 30.06.2021 for pensionary benefits may be paid alongwith 12% interest in light of Hon’ble Apex Court judgments.*
- B. To issue/pass an order or directions to the respondents to decide the representation dated 07.09.2020 preferred by the applicant for granting one increment earned by applicant to respondent no. 3.*
- C. To issue/pass any other order or direction as this Hon’ble Tribunal may deem just, fit and proper under the circumstances of the case in favour of the applicant.*
- D. To allow this original application with costs.”*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 26.06.1993 and was discharged on 30.06.2021 (AN) after serving more than 28 years of service. The applicant preferred a representation dated 07.09.2022 for grant of increment which was due on 01.07.2021 and re-fixation of pension and for issuance of fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. on the ground that after the Seventh Central Pay Commission the Central Government fixed 1st January/ 1st July as the date of increment for all Government Employees but the respondents have not taken any action in this regard. It is in this perspective that the applicant has preferred the present Original Application.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant pleaded that after the Seventh Central Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July/1st January, as the date of increment for all Government Employees, thereafter, the applicant is entitled for grant of last increment due on 01.07.2021 as given in Pay Slip for the month of May 2021 annexed alongwith O.A. He relied upon the law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of ***P. Ayyamperumal Versus The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others*** (W.P. No. 15732 of 2017, decided on 15.09.2017) and the Hon'ble Apex Court judgment in Civil appeal No 2417 of 2023 (SLP No. 6185 of 2020), **The Director (Admin and HR) KPTCL & Ors vs. C.P. Mundinamani & Ors**, decided on 11.04.2023.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that the applicant had served for complete one year from the date of his last annual increment, but he had not been granted annual increment as on the date of his discharge i.e. 30.06.2021 since the date of annual increment fall on the following day i.e. 01.07.2021. Since the applicant was not on the effective strength of Indian Army on 01.07.2021, therefore, he was not granted annual increment on 01.07.2021 as per policy in vogue. He also submitted that in light of the judgment dated 11.04.2023 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in CA No. 2471/2023 to SLP (C) No. 6185/2020 titled as **Director (Admn. And HR) KPTCL & Ors Vs**

C.P. Mundinamani and Ors (2023) SCC Online SC 401 and dismissal of SLP (C) No. 4722/2021 filed by UOI vide order dated 19.05.2023 in the matter relating to grant of notional increment to the Government servants who superannuated on 30th June or 31 December is presently under examination with the competent authority in consultation with D/o Expenditure for according sanction and implementation. Hence, the action taken by the respondents for not granting notional increment to the petitioner is just fair, legal and in accordance to the policy in force.

5. We have heard Ld. Counsel for the applicant as also Ld. Counsel for the respondents and gone through the records and we find that the only question which needs to be answered is that whether the applicant is entitled for one notional increment?

6. The law on notional increment has already been settled by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of ***P. Ayyamperumal Versus The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Others*** (Supra). Against the said Judgment the Union of India had preferred Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.22282 of 2018 which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.07.2018. The relevant portion of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Madras Court is excerpted below:-

"5. The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on 30.06.2013 on attaining the age of superannuation. After the Sixth Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July as the date of increment for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In

view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, ie., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.

6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep.by its Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M. Balasubramaniam, reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs."

7. The Civil Appeal No. 4339 of 2023, Arising out of Diary No. 16764 of 2023, **Union of India & Others vs. Anand Kumar Singh** has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 10.07.2023 in terms of earlier judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 2471 of 2023, **The Director (Admn. and HR) KPTCL & Ors vs. C.P. Mundinamani & Ors** dated 11.04.2023 in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that an employee who has served for a complete year in an

organisation is entitled to annual increment on the last day of service for rendering one full year service.

8. In view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Madras High Court and other courts, upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, we are of the view that applicant has to be treated as having completed one full year of service as on 30.06.2021, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement, i.e. on 01.07.2021 on which date he was not in service, is entitled to annual service increment.

9. In view of the above, the Original Application is **allowed**. The impugned order, if any, is set aside. The applicant shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2020 to 30.06.2021, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2021, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. The respondents are directed to issue fresh Corrigendum P.P.O. accordingly. 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.

10. No order as to costs.

11. Pending Misc. Application(s), if any, shall be treated to have been disposed off.

12. Learned 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 this case, the plea is rejected.

(Maj Gen Sanjay Singh)
Member (A)

(Justice Anil Kumar)
Member (J)

Dated : 2nd May, 2024
SB