

**Court No. 1****ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 1201 of 2023**Wednesday, this the 29<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2024**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Anil Kumar, Member (J)  
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain, Member (A)”**

162956-F, Dharam Singh, Ex. CPO UC I, Resideent of C/o Ajay Kumar Sharma, Pandubbi Mansion, Sharma Colony, Buddha Marg, Ward No. 21, Behind Pathik Niwas Hotel, PO & District Kushinagar, Uttar Pradesh, Pin-274403.

**..... Applicant**

Ld. Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Manish Kumar Rai**, Advocate.

Versus

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, New Delhi-110011.
2. Chief of the Naval Staff, Ministry of Defence (Navy), Integrated Headquarters, Sena Bhawan, New Delhi-110011.
3. Logistic Officer In-Charge, Naval Pension Office (NAVPEN), INS Tana Ji, Sion – Trombay Road, Mankhurd, Mumbai-400088.
4. Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Navy), No. 1, Cooperage Road, Mumbai-400001.

**.....Respondents**

Ld. Counsel for the Respondents. : **Shri Rajvi Pandey**, Advocate  
Central Govt. Standing Counsel

**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 or set aside the Impugned order No. PEN/600/D/LRDO I :07/2013/162956-F dated 29 July 2013 passed by respondent No. 3, by which the claim for disability pension of applicant has been rejected, contained as Annexure 1 to this Original Application.*
- (b) *To issue/pass an order or direction to opposite parties to grant disability element of pension to the applicant @30% for life from the next date of his discharge i.e. from 01.08.2013 by holding disability Primary Hypertension as attributable to and aggravated by Military service and further round it off to 50% by giving the benefit of broad banding in view of Govt. of India, Ministry of Defence letter dated 31.01.2001.*
- (c) *To issue/pass an order or directions to opposite parties to pay arrear of disability element of pension along with 12% interest from the next date of discharge i.e. from 01.08.2013 it is actually paid.*
- (d) *Any other relief which the Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the fact and circumstances of the case in favour of the applicant.*

2. Briefly stated, applicant was enrolled in the Indian Navy on 10.07.1985 and was discharged on 31.07.2013 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 Mumbai on 28.03.2013 assessed his disability '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION (ICD I-10.0)**' @30% for life and opined the disability to be neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service. The applicant's claim for grant of disability pension was rejected vide letter dated 29.07.2013. The applicant preferred First Appeal dated 24.03.2023 which too was rejected vide letter dated 12.10.2023. 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 Navy and there is no note in the service documents that he was suffering from any disease at the time of enrolment in Navy. The disease of the applicant was contracted during the service, hence it is attributable to and aggravated by Naval Service. He pleaded that various Benches of Armed Forces Tribunal have granted disability pension in similar cases, as such the applicant be granted disability element of disability pension and its rounding off to 50%.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that disability of the applicant @30% for life has been regarded as NANA by the RMB, hence in terms Regulations 100 and 105-B of the Navy (Pension) Regulations, 1964 the applicant is not entitled to disability element of disability pension. He further

pleaded that through the applicant was found medically fit in the medical examination conducted during the process of induction but it is possible that the disease which are congenital, hereditary, degenerative and constitutional in nature may not get detected during the medical examination carried out at the time of enrolment. In such cases, therefore, mere developing of disease alone cannot be considered conclusive reason to consider disease as attributable to naval service, unless it is clearly established that the course of the disease was adversely affected due to factors related to conditions of Naval Service. 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 two folds:-

- (a) Whether the disability of the applicant is attributable to or aggravated by Naval 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 disability '**PRIMARY HYPERTENSION (icd i – 10.0)**' is neither attributable to nor aggravated (NANA) by service on the ground that "*The Sailor was borne in submarine for only 49 days before the disability was detected which is not prolonged service*", 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 is cryptic, not convincing and doesn't reflect the complete truth on the matter. Even peace Stations have their own pressure of rigorous Naval training and associated stress and strain of Naval service. The applicant was enrolled in Indian Navy on 10.07.1985 and the disability has started after more than 25 years of Navy service i.e. in August, 2010. 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 the

disability of the applicant should be considered as aggravated by Naval 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 10<sup>th</sup> 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. Additionally, consequent upon the issue of Government of India, Ministry of Defence letter No. 17(01)/2017/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.

10. 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.”*

11. 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/D(Pen/Policy) dated 23.01.2018, we are of the considered view that benefit of rounding off of disability element 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.

12. In view of the above, the **Original Application No. 1201 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, are set aside. The disability of the applicant is held as aggravated by Naval Service. The applicant is entitled to get disability element @30% for life which would be rounded off to 50% 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 @30% for life which would stand rounded off to 50% for life w.e.f. three years preceding the date of filing of Original Application. The date of filing

of Original Application is 26.09.2023. 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

13. No order as to costs.

**(Vice Admiral Atul Kumar Jain )  
Member (A)**

**(Justice Anil Kumar)  
Member (J)**

Dated : 29 May, 2024

AKD/-