# COURT NO. 1 ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Applicant

108.

OA 2108/2019 Ex AG PO (RP) Himanshu Garg .... Versus Union of India & Ors. Respondents

For Applicant Mr. Ved Prakash, Advocate : For Respondents Mr. Arvind Patel, Advocate :

## CORAM

### HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON, CHAIRPERSON HON'BLE LT GEN C.P. MOHANTY, MEMBER (A)

#### ORDER 05.04.2024

Invoking jurisdiction of this Tribunal; the under Section 14, the applicant has filed this application seeking grant of disability pension.

2. The soldier was enrolled in the Indian Navv on 30.01.2004 and discharged from service on 31.01.2019. The RMB dated 11.12.2018 held that the applicant is suffering from disability ~ "Comminuted Fracture Shaft of Tibia Fibula (LT) (Optd)" assessed at 30% for life. It is admitted fact that the disability of the applicant arose due to a road accident sustained by the applicant while driving his bike from Vasant Kunj, Delhi (His Home) to South Block, New Delhi (His Office) on 10.02.2018.

3. With the disability of the applicant assessed at more than 20% by the Release Medical Board, the limited question for consideration before us is whether the travel of applicant from his home to office shall be considered to be 'duty' for the purpose of grant of disability pension or not.

4. We find it pertinent to refer to Para 9 (e) of Entitlement

Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 2008 reproduced as under:

"9. For the purpose of these Rules, a person subject to the disciplinary code of Armed Forces shall be treated to be on duty: XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX (e) When travelling by a reasonable route from one's official residence to and back from an appointed place of duty, irrespective of the mode of conveyance (whether private or provided by the Government). XXX" XXX XXX XXX XXX

5. In view of the settled law laid by this Tribunal with respect to even an armed forces personnel travelling to his duty station from the leave station and vice versa shall be considered to be on 'duty', it is clear from the documents placed on record that the applicant was travelling to his office from his home, and that we don't find any reason not to hold that he should be construed to be on 'duty' at the time of road accident.

6. Accordingly, we allow this application and direct the respondents to grant disability element of pension to the applicant (a) 30% for life which be rounded off to 50% for life from the date of retirement i.e. 31.01.2019 in terms of the judicial pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Union of India Vs. Ram Avtar (Civil Appeal No. 418/2012)* decided on 10.12.2014.

7. Therefore, the respondents are directed to calculate, sanction and issue necessary PPO to the applicant within four

months from the date of receipt of copy of this order, failing which, the applicant shall be entitled to interest @ 6% per annum till the date of payment.

- 8. No order as to costs.
- 9. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

## [JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON] CHAIRPERSON

## [LT GEN C.P. MOHANTY] MEMBER (A)

<u>Ps</u> <u>OA 2108/2019</u>