

E- Court No. 1**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 670 of 2021**Wednesday, this the 12th day of October, 2022**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava (J)
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**

No. 15376890K Ex Hav (ACP II) Santosh Kumar Dubey, Son of Shri Chandra Prakash, Resident of House No 63/A/19A/K-3, Dwarika Kunj, Defence Colony, PO- Pratappura, Tehsil- Sadar, District- Agra, U.P. 282001.

..... Applicant

Counsel for the : **Shri Veer Raghav Chaubey, Advocate**
Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Govt of India, South Block, New Delhi- 110011.
2. Record Office, The Records Signal, PIN- 908770, C/o 56 APO.
3. Principal Controller of Defence Account (Pension), PCDA (P), Draupadi Ghat, Allahabad.

.....Respondents

Counsel for the : **Shri Sunil Sharma**
Respondents. **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 kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to grant the increased disability pension from 50% to 100% to the applicant.

(ii). This Hon’ble Tribunal may grant disability pension wef 30.11.2017 their respective date of retirement.

(iii). Pass any other order or direction which this Hon’ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case.

2. Facts giving rise to Original Application in brief are that applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 02.11.1991 and discharged from service on 30.11.2017 after having rendered about 26 years of service. The applicant met with an accident while on leave at Agra. Applicant was treated in Military Hospital and later on he was placed in low medical category. Release Medical Board (RMB) held on 26.07.2017 at the time of retirement assessed the disability of the applicant @ 50% for life and considered it as neither attributable to

nor aggravated by military service. Claim of the applicant for grant of disability pension was denied vide respondents letter dated 12.02.2018 on the reason that his disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service. His First Appeal for grant of disability pension was also rejected by the respondents vide letter dated 20.09.2019, hence this O.A.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 02.11.1991 and retired from service on 01.12.2017 under Army Rule 13 (3) Item III (a) (i) on completion of his terms of engagement. The applicant met with an accident while on leave and sustained injury. Release Medical Board held at the time of discharge, assessed his disability @ 50% for life and considered it as neither attributable to nor aggravated to military service. Since leave is considered as duty, hence injury sustained by the applicant is connected with military duty. He submitted that various Benches of AFT, Hon'ble High Courts and the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the matter of disability, have held that if an armed forces person suffers with disability during the course of service, which was never reported earlier when he/she was enrolled/recruited in the army, the said disability would be treated to be attributable to or aggravated by military service and he/she shall be entitled to the disability pension for the same.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant in support of his contention placed reliance on the judgment of Punjab & Haryana High Court in the case of ***Barkat Masih vs Union of India & Others***, 2014 SCC on line P&H 10564, Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the case of ***Vardip Singh & Anr v. Union of India & Ors***, 2004 (3) SLR 506, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the cases of ***Lance Dafedar Joginder Singh v. Union of India & Ors***, 1995 Supp (3) SCC 232, and ***Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension) & Ors v. S Balachandran Nair***, 2005 (13) SCC 128 and Hon'ble Jammu & Kashmir High Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Keshar Singh*** (2007) 12 SCC 675. Learned counsel for the applicant prayed that in view of above injury sustained by the applicant be treated as attributable to military service and disability pension be granted to the applicant.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that on retirement applicant was granted service pension vide PPO dated 27.11.2017. It is not disputed that when applicant sustained injury he was on duty but he sustained injury while he was on leave which activity cannot be treated as military duty, as there is no causal connection between the activity resulting in injury and military duty. Release Medical Board opined the injury as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service. Even for grant of the disability

pension it is not only required that armed Forces personnel should be on duty, but there must be some causal connection also between the activity resulting in injury and military service. He further submitted that unless activity resulting in injury sustained has causal connection with military service, armed forces personnel cannot be allowed disability pension merely for being on duty or that disability was not reported/detected while being enrolled or commissioned. He further submitted that though applicant was on duty, but the activity resulting in injury sustained by the applicant has no causal connection with military service. In support, learned counsel for the respondents has placed reliance on the following case laws of the Hon'ble Apex Court:-

- (a) ***Renu Devi v Union of India and others***, Decided on July 03. 2019 in Special Appeal arising out of Diary No. C-37356 of 2017.
- (b) ***Vijay Kumar v. Union of India***, 2016 SCC 460.
- (c) The ***Secretary Govt of India & Others v. Dharamvir Singh*** Decided on 20, September 2019 in Civil Appeal No 4981 of 2012.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.

7. The question which arises for our consideration is, whether a injury sustained while on leave can be treated to be attributable to or aggravated by Army service?

8. After having heard the submissions of learned counsel of both sides we find that there are certain facts admitted to both the parties, i.e., applicant was enrolled in Indian Army on 02.11.1991 and was discharged from service on 01.12.2017. He met with an accident while on leave at Agra and was placed in low medical category P2(P) and his disability was considered as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military duty and was assessed @ 50% for life. Claim of the applicant for grant of disability element was rejected by the respondents being neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service.

9. The respondents have denied disability element to the applicant for the reason that disability of the applicant was considered as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service by Release Medical Board. For getting disability pension, in respect of injury sustained, there must be some causal connection between the activity resulting in the disability and military service and this being lacking in applicant's case, applicant is not entitled for the same.

10. Hon^{ble} the Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India & ors*** vs. ***Ex Naik Vijay Kumar***, in Civil Appeal No. 6583 of 2015 (arising out of CAD No. 13923 of 2014), decided on 26.08.2015 has observed that there should be some nexus between the Military duty and the incident/accident resulting in the injury to a person subject to Military Act; if there is no causal connection between the Military duty and the accident which resulted into injury, then the injury sustained cannot be treated to be result of Army duty. Further contention of learned counsel for the respondents is that the pension sanctioning authority has rightly denied disability element claim. Rule 12 of Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards stipulates that there should be some causal connection of injury/disability to military duty for grant of disability element of pension.

11. A large number of judgments have been pronounced by various Courts vide which it has been made clear that the cause of injury suffered by the military personnel should bear a causal connection with military service. Whether injury was suffered during annual leave or casual leave or at the place of posting or during working hours is not the only consideration because attributability to military service is a factor which is required to be established in all such cases.

12. Hon“ble Delhi High Court in the case of **Madan Singh Shekhawat**, AIR 1999 SC 3378 says that Army personnel will be deemed to be on duty when they are on any type of authorized leave while travelling to or from home station to/ from place of posting/ duty station. Since in the facts of that case, the applicant was travelling for getting his return reservation to join duty, had met with an accident, therefore, it was held that the injury sustained by the applicant was attributable to Army service, therefore, the *ratio decidendi* is that there must be a reasonable nexus between the cause of injury sustained and the Army duty.

13. The Full Bench decision of Hon“ble Delhi High Court in the case of **Ex Nk Dilbag Singh vs Union of India & Ors** delivered on 22.08.2008 in Writ Petition No. (C) 6959 of 2004 and connected matters, their Lordships observed in para-19, 23 and 24 as under:-

“19. For similar reasons we are unable to subscribe to the views in Ex. Sepoy Hayat Mohammed -vs- Union of India, 138(2007) DLT 539(DB) to the effect that the petitioner was eligible for the grant of Disability Pension owing to the fact that while on casual leave in his home he suffered several injuries owing to a steel girder and roof slabs falling on him. One of the reasons which appear to have

persuaded the same Division Bench was that persons on annual leave are subject to the Army Act and can be recalled at any time as leave is at the discretion of the Authorities concerned. A rule of this nature is necessary to cover the eruption of insurgencies or the breakout of a war. They neither envisage nor attempt to deal with liability to pay Disability Pension. It is impermissible to extrapolate a rule catering for a particular situation to altogether different circumstances.

23. We have also perused the detailed Judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in Shri Bhagwan wherein Jarnail Singh also came to be discussed. The Bench observed that - "An individual may be "on duty" for all practical purposes such as receipt of wages etc. but that does not mean that he is "on duty" for the purpose of claiming disability pension under the 1982 Entitlement Rules. A person to be on duty is required, under the 1982 Entitlement Rules, to be performing a task, the failure to do which would constitute an offence triable under the disciplinary code applicable to him. A person operating a wheat thresher while on casual leave cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be said to be performing an official duty or a task the failure to perform which would lead to disciplinary action". We respectfully affirm these views of the Division Bench.

24. To sum up our analysis, the foremost feature, consistently highlighted by the Hon^{ble} Supreme Court, is that it requires to be established that the injury or fatality suffered by the concerned military personnel bears a causal connection with military service. Secondly, if this obligation exists so far as discharge from the Armed

Forces on the opinion of a Medical Board the obligation and responsibility a fortiori exists so far as injuries and fatalities suffered during casual leave are concerned. Thirdly, as a natural corollary it is irrelevant whether the concerned personnel was on casual or annual leave at the time or at the place when and where the incident transpired. This is so because it is the causal connection which alone is relevant. Fourthly, since travel to and fro the place of posting may not appear to everyone as an incident of military service, a specific provision has been incorporated in the Pension Regulations to bring such travel within the entitlement for Disability Pension if an injury is sustained in this duration. Fifthly, the Hon^{ble} Supreme Court has simply give effect to this Rule and has not laid down in any decision that each and every injury sustained while availing of casual leave would entitle the victim to claim Disability Pension. Sixthly, provisions treating casual leave as on duty would be relevant for deciding questions pertaining to pay or to the right of the Authorities to curtail or cancel the leave. Such like provisions have been adverted to by the Supreme Court only to buttress their conclusion that travel to and fro the place of posting is an incident of military service. Lastly, injury or death resulting from an activity not connected with military service would not justify and sustain a claim for Disability Pension. This is so regardless of whether the injury or death has occurred at the place of posting or during working hours. This is because attributability to military service is a factor which is required to be established.”

14. The aforesaid view expressed by Full Bench of Hon^{ble} Delhi High Court was considered by the Hon^{ble} Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India & Ors vs. Jujhar Singh***, reported in (2011) 7 SCC 735. The Hon^{ble} Supreme Court has also considered the case of ***Regional Director, E.S.I. Corporation & anr vs. Francis De Costa and another***, (1996) 6 SCC 1. Though the case of ***Francis De Costa*** (supra) was not a case relating to Army, but the question involved in that case was whether the injury sustained by respondent in the said case amounted to “employment injury” within the meaning of Employees’ State Insurance Act, 1948 and he is entitled to claim disablement benefit. This question was replied by Hon^{ble} Apex Court in negative. The Hon^{ble} Apex Court observed as under:-

“A road accident may happen anywhere at any time. But such accident cannot be said to have arisen out of employment, unless it can be shown that the employee was doing something incidental to his employment.”

15. In the case of ***Jujhar Singh*** (supra) Hon^{ble} Apex Court has concluded in Para 23 as under:-

“23. As rightly pointed by the counsel for the Union of India, the High Court failed to appreciate that even though

the respondent sustained injuries while he was on annual leave in 1987, he was kept in service till superannuation and he was superannuated from service w.e.f. 01.07.1998. It is relevant to point out that he was also granted full normal pension as admissible under the Regulations. In the case on hand, inasmuch as the injury which had no connection with the military service even though suffered during annual leave cannot be termed as attributable to or aggravated by military service. The member of the Armed Forces who is claiming disability pension must be able to show a normal nexus between the act, omission or commission resulting in an injury to the person and the normal expected standard of duties and way of life expected from member of such forces. Inasmuch as the respondent sustained disability when he was on annual leave that too at his home town in a road accident, the conclusion of the learned Single Judge that he is entitled to disability pension under Regulation 179 is not based on any material whatsoever. Unfortunately, the Division Bench, without assigning any reason, by way of a cryptic order, confirmed the order of the learned Single Judge.”

16. The view expressed by the Full Bench of the Hon“ble Delhi High Court, approved by the Hon“ble Apex Court, clearly establishes that the requirement of law is that it has to be established that the cause of injury suffered by the Military personnel bears a causal connection with military service. Whether injury was suffered during annual leave or casual leave or at the place of posting or during working hours is not the only consideration because attributability to military service is a factor which is required to be established in all such cases. A careful study of observations made in the case of ***Ex Nk Dilbagh Singh vs Union of India***, 2008 (106) Delhi Reported Judgments 865 shows that it considered the word “duty” as given in Appendix II of Regulation 423 of Medical Services of Armed Forces Regulations, 1983 defining the attributability to service.

17. In the case of ***Union of India & Ors vs. Baljit Singh***, reported in (1996) 11 SCC 315, decided by the Hon’ble Apex Court, their Lordships observed that in each case where a disability pension is sought for and made a claim, it must be affirmatively established as a fact as to whether the injury sustained was due to military service.

18. The consequence of the principle of law laid down by the Hon“ble Full Bench in the case of ***Ex Nk Dilbag Singh*** (supra)

is that there should be a causal connection between the commission or omission of the act of the Army personnel with discharge of his military duty which is sine qua non for the claim of disability pension. This principle of law laid down in the case of **Ex Nk Dilbag Singh** (Supra) was nodded with approval by the Hon^{ble} Apex Court in the case of **Jujhar Singh** (Supra).

19. It may be noticed that in the case of **Union of India and another vs Talwinder Singh**, (2012) 5 SCC 480, Hon^{ble} the Apex Court has also considered the same point of grant of disability pension for injury sustained while on annual leave. The Apex Court in Paras 11, 12 and 14 of the judgment has held as follows:-

“11. This Court recently decided an identical case in Union of India & Ors. v. Jujhar Singh, AIR 2011 SC 2598, and after reconsidering a large number of earlier judgments including Secretary, Ministry of Defence & Ors. v. A.V. Damodaran (dead) through L.Rs. & Ors., (2009) 9 SCC 140; Baljit Singh’s (supra); Regional Director, ESI Corporation & Anr. v. Francis De Costa & Anr., AIR 1997 SC 432, came to the conclusion that in view of Regulation 179, a discharged person can be granted disability pension only if the disability is attributable to or aggravated by military service and such a finding has been recorded by Service Medical Authorities. In case the Medical Authorities records the specific finding to the effect that disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by the military

service, the court should not ignore such a finding for the reason that Medical Board is specialised authority composed of expert medical doctors and it is a final authority to give opinion regarding attributability and aggravation of the disability due to the military service and the conditions of service resulting in the disablement of the individual.

“12. A person claiming disability pension must be able to show a reasonable nexus between the act, omission or commission resulting in an injury to the person and the normal expected standard of duties and way of life expected from such person. As the military personnel sustained disability when he was on an annual leave that too at his home town in a road accident, it could not be held that the injuries could be attributable to or aggravated by military service. Such a person would not be entitled to disability pension. This view stands fully fortified by the earlier judgment of this Court in Ministry of Defence v. Ajit Singh.”

14. We are of the view that the opinion of the Medical Board which is an expert body must be given due weight, value and credence. Person claiming disability pension must establish that the injury suffered by him bears a causal connection with military service. In the instant case, as the injury suffered by the respondent could not be attributable to or aggravated by the military service he is not entitled for disability pension.”

20. Hon“ble Apex Court in the case of **Sukhwant Singh vs Union of India & Ors**, (2012) 12 SCC 228 has again considered this point and held in para 6 as under:-

“6. In our view, the Tribunal has rightly summed up the legal position on the issue of entitlement of disability pension resulting from any injuries, etc. and it has correctly held that in both cases there was no casual connection between the injuries suffered by the appellants and their service in the military and their cases were, therefore, clearly not covered by Regulation 173 of the Regulations. The view taken by the Tribunal is also supported by a recent decision of this Court in Union of India vs Jujhar Singh.”

21. Thus, the Hon“ble Apex Court has confirmed the view taken by the Armed Forces Tribunal. By the said judgment, Hon“ble Apex Court has decided two Appeals by a common judgment. First Appeal was of **Sukhwant Singh vs. Union of India**, (Civil Appeal No. 1987/2011) and the other was **Jagtar Singh vs. Union of India** (Civil Appeal No. 1988 of 2011).

22. Facts of Civil Appeal No. 1987 of 2011, as they appear from the judgment of Hon“ble Apex Court, were as under:-

“Appellant Sukhwant Singh, enrolled in the Army, while he was on nine days’ casual leave, sustained an injury in a scooter accident that rendered him unsuitable for any further military service. Therefore, he was discharged from

service and his claim for the disability pension was rejected by the authorities concerned on the ground that the injury sustained by the appellant was not attributable to military service as stipulated in Regulation 173 of the Army Pension Regulations, 1961.”

23. Facts of Civil Appeal No. 1988 of 2011, as noticed by Hon^{ble} Apex Court in aforesaid Civil Appeal, were as under:-

“Appellant Jagtar Singh was on two months’ annual leave. He met with an accident in which his brother died and he himself received serious injuries that led to the amputation of his left leg above the knee. In his petition appellant did not disclose the circumstances in which the accident took place.”

24. In the above mentioned factual background, the Tribunal rejected the claim of the Army personnel for grant of disability pension for the reasons mentioned in detail in its judgment. The reasons given by the Tribunal were considered by the Hon^{ble} Apex Court in its judgment and the same were confirmed.

25. To consider as to what acts are covered by the term “duty” we may like to make reference to clause 12 of “Entitlement Rules Appendix II” which defines the word “duty”, which for convenience sake may be reproduced as under:

“DUTY: 12. A person subject to the disciplinary code of the Armed Forces is on “duty”:- (a) When performing an official task or a task, failure to do which would constitute an offence triable under the disciplinary code applicable to him.

(b) When moving from one place of duty to another place of duty irrespective of the mode of movement.

(c) During the period of participation in recreation and other unit activities organised or permitted by Service Authorities and during the period of travelling in a body or singly by a prescribed or organised route.

Note:1

(a) Personnel of the Armed Forces participating in

(i) Local/national / international sports tournaments

as member of service teams, or,

(ii) Mountaineering expeditions / gliding organised by service authorities, with the approval of Service Hqrs. will be deemed to be “on duty” for purposes of these rules.

(b) Personnel of the Armed Forces participating in the above named sports tournaments or in privately organised mountaineering expeditions or indulging in gliding as a hobby in their individual capacity, will not be deemed to be „on duty“ for purposes of these rules, even though prior permission of the competent service authorities may have been obtained by them.

(c) Injuries sustained by the personnel of the Armed Forces in impromptu games and sports outside parade hours, which are organised by, or disability arising from such injuries, will continue to

be regarded as having occurred while „on duty“ for purposes of these rules.

Note: 2

The personnel of the Armed Forces deputed for training at courses conducted by the Himalayan Mountaineering Institute, Darjeeling shall be treated on par with personnel attending other authorised professional courses or exercises for the Defence Services for the purpose of the grant of disability family pension on account of disability/death sustained during the courses.

(d) When proceeding from his leave station or returning to duty from his leave station, provided entitled to travel at public expenses i.e. on railway warrants, on concessional voucher, on cash TA (irrespective of whether railway warrant/cash TA is admitted for the whole journey or for a portion only), in government transport or when road mileage is paid/payable for the journey.

(e) When journeying by a reasonable route from one's quarter to and back from the appointed place of duty, under organised arrangements or by a private conveyance when a person is entitled to use service transport but that transport is not available.

(f) An accident which occurs when a man is not strictly on duty“ as defined may also be attributable to service, provided that it involved risk which was definitely enhanced in kind or degree by the nature, conditions, obligations or incidents of his service and that the same was not a risk common to human existence in modern conditions in India. Thus for instance, where a person is killed or injured by another party by reason of belonging to the Armed Forces, he shall

be deemed „on duty“ at the relevant time. This benefit will be given more liberally to the claimant in cases occurring on active service as defined in the Army/Navy/Air Force Act.”

26. The co-ordinate Bench of the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh in the case of **Baldev Singh vs Union of India**, O.A. No. 3690 of 2013 decided on 02.03.2016 has considered this question in great detail. It would be fruitful to reproduce para-21 as follows:-

“21. Recently, the Apex Court in Civil Appeal No.6583 of 2015 Union of India & others Versus Ex Naik Vijay Kumar, vide its judgment dated 26th August, 2015 has held that if the injury suffered or death caused to an individual, has no causal connection with the military service, it cannot be said that the said disability or death is attributable to military service. In the said judgment, the apex court has considered para 12 of the judgment given in another case Union of India and Another Vs. Talwinder Singh (2012) 5 SCC 480 which is reproduced as below :

“12. A person claiming disability pension must be able to show a reasonable nexus between the act, omission or commission resulting in an injury to the person and the normal expected standard of duties and way of life expected from such person. As the military personnel sustained disability when he was on annual leave that too at his home town in a road accident, it could not be held that the injuries could be attributable to or aggravated by military service.

Such a person would not be entitled to disability pension. This view stands fully fortified by the earlier judgment of this court in Ministry of Defence V. Ajit Singh, (2009) 7 SCC 328.

27. We are in full agreement with the views expressed by the Co-ordinate Bench of Armed Forces Tribunal, Chandigarh in the case of **Baldev Singh** (supra), which finds full support from several pronouncements of the Hon^{ble} Apex Court, and keeping in view the principle of law laid down in that case, we find that learned counsel for the applicant has not been able to make out a case in the present O.A. in which the applicant's injury which took place while applicant was on leave, since this is an activity which has no causal connection with Army duty.

28. We have considered the applicant's case in view of above guiding factors and we find that, though, applicant was on duty when met with accident and sustained injury resulting into disability @ 50% for life but the activity in which he sustained injury being not connected with his army duty in any manner, he is not entitled to the disability pension for the same. We also find that rulings relied upon by the applicant being either based on different facts or overruled are of no help to him.

29. In the result, we hold that the claim of applicant's disability pension has rightly been rejected by the respondents which needs no interference. Resultantly, O.A. is **dismissed**.

30. No order as to cost.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (A) **Member (J)**

Dated : 12 October, 2022

Ukt/-