

Court No. 1**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW****Original Application No 73 of 2022**Thursday, this the 26th day of May, 2022**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)**
Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)Sarvesh Kumar, Ex. Hav No. 2985493K
S/o Late Sri Chhote Lal
R/o Village ; Bandhaua, PO : Masaini, Kaimganj,
District : Farrukhabad (UP) – 209601

..... Applicant

Ld. Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri V.K. Pandey**, Advocate

Versus

1. The Union of India, through Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence, South Block, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110011.
2. Dir PS-4, AG's Branch HQs , DHQ PO, New Delhi – 110011.
3. OIC Records, Records The Rajput Regiment, 900427, C/o 56 APO.
4. P.C.D.A. (P), Draupadi Ghat, Prayagraj/Allahabad (UP)-14.

..... Respondents

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

1. The instant Original Application has been filed on behalf of the applicant under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for the following reliefs:-

- “(i) That this Hon'ble Tribunal may kindly be pleased to direct the opp. parties to grant the disability pension @ 50% to the applicant for life w.e.f. 01.05.2021 to actual date of payment and also onwards, and provide the interest on the aforesaid delayed amount of disability

pension with 18% p.a. since due date to actual date of payment in the interest of justice.

- (ii) That this Hon'ble Tribunal may kindly be pleased to award the cost Rs. 20,20,000/- (Rs. Twenty Lac and Twenty Thousand only) to the applicant against the opposite parties and allow the same.
- (iii) That this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to pass any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper be passed in favour of the applicant.”

2. Briefly stated facts of the case are that applicant was enrolled in the Army on 26.04.1985 and was discharged from service on 30.04.2011 (FN) in low medical category P2 (Permanent) after rendering more than 26 years of service under Rule 13 (3) III (i) of Army Rules, 1954. The Release Medical Board (RMB) assessed his disability “**DIABETES MELLITUS TYPE-2**” @ 20% for life and opined the disability as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service (NANA). The applicant is in receipt of service in the rank of Hony Nb Sub vide PPO dated 03.02.2012. Disability pension claim of the applicant was rejected vide order dated 07.06.2011. The appeal preferred by the applicant was rejected by the respondents vide order dated 02.02.2022. It is in this perspective that the applicant has preferred the present O.A.

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. The disease of the applicant was contracted during the service, hence it is attributable to and aggravated by Military Service. He also submitted that case of the applicant is fully covered from the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Hon'ble High Courts as well as Armed Forces Tribunal and pleaded that applicant be granted disability pension @ 50% for life.

4. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondents contended that disability of the applicant i.e. "**DIABETES MELLITUS TYPE-2**" has been regarded as 20% for life by RMB as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service and not connected with service. Hence, as per Rule 173 of Pension Regulations for the Army,1961 (Part-1) and Rule 53 (a) of Pension Regulations for the Army,2008 (Part-1), applicant is not entitled for disability pension. He pleaded for dismissal of the O.A.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record. We have also gone through the RMB and the rejection order of disability pension claim. The question before us is simple and straight – is the disability of applicant attributable to or aggravated by military service?

6. The law on attributability of a disability has already been well settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Dharamvir Singh Vs. Union of India and Ors***, (2013) 7 SCC 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/aggravation, we find that the RMB has denied attributability/aggravation to applicant for the reason by declaring the disease as NANA and not connected with military service. However, on further scrutiny, we have observed that disability was initially detected in the year 2010 after about 25 years of service. We are, therefore, of the considered opinion that the reasons given in RMB for

declaring disease as NANA is very brief and cryptic in nature and do not adequately explain the denial of attributability. Hence, we are inclined to give benefit of doubt in favour of the applicant as per the Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment of **Dharamvir Singh** (supra) and his disability should be considered as aggravated by military service.

8. In view of the above, applicant is held entitled to 20% disability element for life from the date of discharge from service. The applicant will also be eligible for the benefit of rounding off of disability element from 20% to 50% for life in terms of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union of India and others v. Ram Avtar** (Civil Appeal No 418 of 2012 dated 10.12.2014).

9. As a result of foregoing discussion, the O.A. is **allowed**. The impugned order passed by the respondents is set aside. The disability of the applicant is to be considered as aggravated by military service. The applicant is entitled to disability element of pension @ 20% for life duly rounded off to 50% for life from the next date of discharge from service. The respondents are directed to grant disability element @ 50% for life from the next date of discharge from service. However, due to law of limitations settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Shiv Dass v. Union of India and others** (2007 (3) SLR 445), the arrear of disability element will be restricted to three years preceding the date of filing of the instant O.A. The date of filing of this O.A is 01.02.2022. The respondents are directed to give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of

certified copy of the order. Default will invite interest @ 8% per annum from the date of this order till actual payment.

10. No order as to costs.

11. Pending Misc. Application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

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

Dated: May, 2022
SB