

**Court No. 1****ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 580 of 2019**Monday, this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava (J)  
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**

Smt. Neelam Singh  
 W/o No. 16017511H Late Rfn Jitendra Singh  
 R/o 592/66 Majid Line Subhani Kheda,  
 Vrindavan Colony, Telibag, Lucknow

..... Applicant

Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Angrej Nath Shukla**, Advocate  
 Versus

1. Union of India through Ministry of Defence, Department of Ex-Servicemen Welfare-D (Pension Grievances), Room No. 227, B Wing, Sena Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Director/PS-4, Integrated HQ of MoD, AG’s Branch, Pin-900266, C/o 56 APO.
3. Ministry of Personal PG & Pensioners, Department of Pension & Pensioners Welfare 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Lok Nayak Bhawan, Khan Market, New Delhi – 110003.
4. The Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Draupadighat, Allahabad-211014.
5. Record Office Rajputana Rifles, Pin-900106, C/o 56 APO.  
 .....Respondents

Counsel for the Respondents : **Shri Yogesh Kesarwani**  
 Central Govt. Counsel

**ORDER**

1. The instant Original Application has been filed by the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 with the following prayers:

“(a) *To set aside the impugned order dated 18.11.2019 passed by the opposite party no-5 which he has rejected the claim of applicant by misinterpreting the*

*Rules & Regulation contained as Annexure No-1 to this application.*

- (b) *To direct the opposite parties to consider and take necessary action for payment of special family pension of No 16017511H Late Rfn Jitendra Singh.*
- (c) *To issue any other appropriate order or direction as this Hon'ble Tribunal deem fit and proper in nature and circumstances of the case.*
- (d) *To allow this application in favour of the applicant with cost."*

2. Facts giving rise to Original Application in brief are that husband of applicant was enrolled in the Army on 22.12.2003. While he was posted to 20 RAJ RIF unit, he was granted 04 days Advance of Annual Leave from 06.11.2010 to 09.11.2010 with permission to prefix on 05.11.2010. On 06.11.2010 husband of applicant met with a road accident and subsequently died on 15.11.2010 in Command Hospital, Lucknow. A Court of Inquiry was convened and it was opined that death of husband of applicant was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service and also not connected with military service. Accordingly, the applicant was granted Ordinary Family Pension w.e.f. 16.11.2010 vide PCDA (P) Allahabad PPO No. F/NA/011567/2011 (Army) dated 29.07.2011. Thereafter, applicant approached to opposite party No. 4 and 5 to sanction Special Family Pension but her case was rejected vide order dated 05.05.2017. Then she preferred an appeal against the rejection of claim of Special Family pension on 13.02.2018 but no action was taken by the respondents. Thereafter, she preferred O.A. No. 384 of 2018 before this Tribunal which was disposed of on 31.08.2018 with direction to the respondents to decide the pending appeal of the applicant dated 13.02.2018 by a speaking and reasoned order in accordance with law

within a period of three months. On 08.09.2018, applicant gave an application along with copy of the order to comply with the Hon'ble Tribunal's order but till date order has not been complied with. Thereafter applicant filed Execution Application No. 236 of 2018, the opposite party No. 5 has passed the impugned order dated 18.11.2019 denying Special Family Pension. Being aggrieved, the applicant has filed Original Application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India & Ors vs. Surendra Pandey***, LAWS(SC) 2014 9 172, decided on 18.09.2014, ***Sukhwant Singh vs. Union of India & Ors***, LAWS(SC) 2012 3 69, decided on 13.03.2012, ***Union of India vs. S.K. Kapoor***, LAWS(SC) 2011 3 43, decided on 16.03.2011 and ***Madan Singh Shekhawat vs. Union of India***, LAWS(SC) 1999 8 6, decided on 17.08.1999. He further placed reliance :-

(a) In the case of ***Yadvinder Singh Virk vs. Union of India & Ors*** in Civil Writ Petition No. 6066 of 2007 (2009 SCC Online P & H) before the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajai Lamba, the Hon'ble Judge quoted an earlier judgment in the case of Ex Naik Kishan Singh vs. Union of India, 2008 (3) SLR 327.

(b) Judgment of a Division Bench of Delhi High Court in ***Ex. Sepoy Hayat Mohammed vs. Union of India***, 2008 (1) SCT 425.

(c) Judgment of AFT (RB) Kolkata passed order in ***O.A. No. 52 of 2015, Debasish Ghosh vs. Union of India & Ors***,

*decided on 15.03.2016* in light of pronouncement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 1987 of 2011 in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to quote from a judgment of AFT, Chandigarh Bench.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant further submitted that :-
- (a) As per Section 95 (a) of the pension Regulations for the Army 1961 (Part-1), rates of consolidated Special Family Pension inclusive of children allowance and children education allowance shall be as under "***irrespective of whether the deceased pension of the Armed Forces, had completed 7 years of service or not***" but this aspect has also not been considered at the time of passing impugned order.
- (b) In Section 213, it is provided that special family pension may be granted to the family of an individual if his death was due to or hastened by :
- (a) a wound, injury or disease which was attributable to military service.*
- OR
- (b) the aggravation by military service of a wound, injury or disease, which existed before or arose during military service.*

Learned counsel for the applicant pleaded that in view of aforesaid rulings and judgments, death of husband of applicant should be treated attributable to military service and special family pension to be granted to the applicant.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that it is not disputed that husband of applicant met with a road accident and died on 15.11.2010 during leave. However, for grant of the special

family pension it is not only required that armed forces personnel should be on duty, but there must be some causal connection also between the injury and military service. He further submitted that unless injury sustained/death during leave has causal connection with military service, armed forces personnel cannot be allowed disability pension/special family pension merely on the reason of being on duty. He further submitted that in the given facts, husband of applicant being on leave at home when he met with a road accident resulted in death, there was no causal connection between the injury sustained/death and military service and, therefore, applicant is not entitled to special family pension, as she is claiming. In support, learned counsel for the respondents has placed reliance on the following facts:-

(a) The injury/death of husband of applicant was opined as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service and also not connected with military service by the Court of Inquiry.

(b) First Appeal was also rejected vide order dated 27.07.2019 which reads **“No. 16074511 Late Rfn Jitendra Singh died on 15 Nov 2010 due to “ROAD ACCIDENT”.** ***Since the circumstances of death are not in anyway related to duties of military service. The committee has, therefore, rejected her appeal.***

(b) In terms of Para 213 of Pension Regulations for the Army, 1961 (Part-1) and Para 6 of Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982, applicant is not entitled to

Special Family Pension which was communicated to her vide letter dated 13.05.2011. Para 213 reads as under :-

***“a special family pension may be granted to the family of an individual if his death was due to or hastened by :-***

***(a) A wound, injury or disease which was attributable to military service.***

**OR**

***(b) The aggravation by military service of a wound, injury or disease which existed before or arose during military service”.***

Since the circumstances of death are not related to the duties of military services and was opined as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service, hence, applicant is not entitled for special family pension.

6. We have heard Shri Angrej Nath Shukla, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, learned counsel for the respondents and have also perused the record.

7. After having heard the submissions of learned counsel of both sides we found that certain facts are admitted to both the parties and husband of applicant met with a Road Traffic Accident on 06.11.2010 and later on died in Command Hospital, Lucknow on 15.11.2010.

8. In this case, a Court of Inquiry was also convened, in which it is stated in the findings of the Court that Rif Jitendra Singh while driving motorcycle met with an accident with another motorcycle on Rae Bareilly Road and was seriously injured. After the accident the soldier was evacuated to Command Hospital, Lucknow where he was admitted in ICU and died on 15.11. 2010. The opinion of the Court is that :-

(a) The death of Army No. 16017511H Rfn Jitendra Singh has occurred on 15 Nov 2010 in the Comd Hospital, Lucknow where he was evacuated after a Road Traffic Accident on 06 Nov 2010. There is no foul play or malafide intention involved in his death.

(b) The death of Army No. 16017511H Rfn Jitendra Singh is not attributable to Military Service as the indl was on Advance of Annual Leave.

(c) Due justice be given to the family members and dependents of 16017511H Rfn Jitendra Singh and they be compensated as per existing Rules and Regulations on the subject.

(d) The family may be advised to file MACT case to claim compensation.

Sd/- x x x xx  
Presiding Officer

9. The respondents have denied special family pension to the applicant on the reason that for getting special family pension, in respect of injury sustained resulted to death during the course of employment, there must be some causal connection between the injury/death and military service, and this being lacking in applicant's case, as there was no causal connection between the injury sustained/death and military service, she is not entitled for the same.

10. This question has been considered time and again not only by the various Benches of AFT but by the Hon'ble High Courts and the Hon'ble Apex Court. In a more or less similar matter, **Secretary, Govt of India & Others Vs. Dharamveer Singh**, decided on 20 September 2019, in Civil Appeal No 4981 of 2012, the facts of the case were that respondent of that case met with an accident during the leave period, while riding a scooter and suffered head injury with '**Faciomaxillary and Compound Fracture 1/3 Femur (LT)**'. A Court of enquiry was conducted in that matter to investigate into the circumstances under

which the respondent sustained injuries. The Brigade Commander gave Report, dated August 18, 1999 to the effect that injuries, occurred in peace area, were attributable to military service. One of the findings of the report recorded under Column 3 (c) was that "No one was to be blamed for the accident. In fact respondent lost control of his own scooter". In this case the respondent was discharged from service after rendering pensionable service of 17 years and 225 days. In pursuance to report of the Medical Board dated November 29, 1999, which held his disability to be 30%, the claim for disability pension was rejected by the Medical Board on the ground that the disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service. An appeal filed by the respondent against the rejection of his claim for the disability pension was rejected by the Additional Directorate General, Personnel Services. Respondent then filed an O.A. in Armed Forces Tribunal against the order of denial of disability pension which after relying upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Madan Singh Shekhawat v. Union of India & Ors***, (1999) 6 SSC 459 was allowed by the Tribunal holding that respondent was entitled to disability pension. Aggrieved by the same, this Civil Appeal was filed in which the Hon'ble Apex Court framed following 3 points for consideration:-

- (a) Whether, when Armed Forces Personnel proceeds on casual leave or annual leave or leave of any kind, he is to be treated on duty?.



(b) Whether the injury or death caused if any, the armed forces personnel is on duty, has to have some causal connection with military service so as to hold that such injury or death is either attributable to or aggravated by military service?.

(c) What is the effect and purpose of Court of Inquiry into an injury suffered by armed forces personnel?.

11. The Hon'ble Apex Court decided the question number 1 in affirmative holding that when armed forces personnel is availing casual leave or annual leave, is to be treated on duty.

12. While deciding the second question the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 20 of the judgment held as under:-

“ In view of Regulations 423 clauses (a) , (b), there has to be causal connection between the injury or death caused by the military service. The determining factor is a causal connection between the accident and the military duties. The injury be connected with military service howsoever remote it may be. The injury or death must be connected with military service. The injury or death must be intervention of armed forces service and not an accident which could be attributed to risk common to human being. When a person is going on a scooter to purchase house hold articles, such activity, even remotely, has no causal connection with the military service”.

13. Regarding question number 3, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that if a causal connection has not been found between the disabilities and military service, applicant would not be entitled to the disability pension. While deciding this issue, the Hon'ble Apex Court has discussed several cases decided by itself as well as the various Benches of the Armed Forces Tribunal and the High Courts and has held that when armed forces personnel suffers injury while returning from or going to leave, it shall be treated to have causal connection

with military service and, for such injury, resulting in disability, the injury would be considered attributable to or aggravated by military service.

14. The Hon'ble Apex Court while summing up took note of following guiding factors by the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench, Chandigarh, in the case of **Jagtar Singh v. Union of India & Ors**, Decided on November 02, 2020 in TA No 61 of 2010 approved in the case of **Sukhwant Singh** and **Vijay Kumar** case, and held that they do not warrant any modification and the claim of disability pension is required to be dealt with accordingly. Those guiding factors are reproduced below for reference:-

*“(a) The mere fact of a person being on 'duty' or otherwise, at the place of posting or on leave, is not the sole criteria for deciding attributability of disability/death. There has to be a relevant and reasonable causal connection, howsoever remote, between the incident resulting in such disability/death and military service for it to be attributable. This conditionality applies even when a person is posted and present in his unit. It should similarly apply when he is on leave; notwithstanding both being considered as 'duty'.*

*(b) If the injury suffered by the member of the Armed Force is the result of an act alien to the sphere of military service or in no way be connected to his being on duty as understood in the sense contemplated by Rule 12 of the Entitlement Rules 1982, it would not be legislative intention or nor to our mind would be permissible approach to generalise the statement that every injury suffered during such period of leave would necessarily be attributable.*

*(c) The act, omission or commission which results in injury to the member of the force and consequent disability or fatality must relate to military service in some manner or the other, in other words, the act must flow as a matter of necessity from military service.*

*(d) A person doing some act at home, which even remotely does not fall within the scope of his duties and functions as a Member of Force, nor is remotely connected with the functions of military service, cannot be termed as injury or disability attributable to military service. An accident or injury suffered by a member of the Armed Force must have some casual connection with military service and at least should arise from such activity of the member of the force as he is expected to maintain or do in his day-to-day life as a member of the force.*

*(e) The hazards of Army service cannot be stretched to the extent of unlawful and entirely un-connected acts or omissions on the part of the member of the force even when he is on leave. A fine line of distinction has to be drawn between the matters connected, aggravated or attributable to military service, and the matter entirely alien to such service. What falls ex-facie in the domain of an entirely private act cannot be treated as legitimate basis for claiming the relief under these provisions. At best, the member of the force can claim disability pension if he suffers disability from an injury while on casual leave even if it arises from some negligence or misconduct on the part of the member of the force, so far it has some connection and nexus to the nature of the force. At least remote attributability to service would be the condition precedent to claim under Rules 173. The act of omission and commission on the part of the member of the force must satisfy the test of prudence, reasonableness and expected standards of behavior”.*

*(f) The disability should not be the result of an accident which could be attributed to risk common to human existence in modern conditions in India, unless such risk is enhanced in kind or degree by nature, conditions, obligations or incidents of military service.”*

15. We have considered the applicant's case in view of above guiding factors and we find that husband of applicant was on Advance of Annual Leave when he met with accident with another motorcycle and sustained injury and later on died, the activity in which he sustained injury resulted to death being not connected with his military duties in any manner, she is not entitled to special family 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 her.

16. In the result, we hold that the claim of special family pension has rightly been rejected by the respondents which needs no interference. Resultantly, O.A. is **dismissed**.

17. No order as to cost.

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

Dated: January, 2021  
 SB