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

41.

OA 1841/2024 WITH MA 2321/2024

Ex Sgt Ravi Kant (Retd) and Ors.	.....	Applicant
Versus		
Union of India & Ors.	.....	Respondents

For Applicant : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For Respondents : Sqn Ldr A.K. Nautiyal, OIC, Legal Cell

CORAM

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

ORDER
29.05.2024

MA 2321/2024

Vide this MA, filed under Rule 4(5) of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules 2008, the six applicants arrayed in the OA seek permission to institute the present OA. In view of the factum that each of them submit to the effect that they impugn the orders issued by respondent No.2 with regard to clarification on notional increment and they have a common interest and in view of the fact that all the applicants are being represented by the same learned counsel whose authorization and Vakalatnama is placed on the record, the said MA is allowed and the applicants are allowed to join together to institute the present OA.

OA 1841/2024

2. The applicants, vide the present OA, make the following prayers:

"(a). To direct the respondent to grant 01 notional for pensionary benefits to the applicants. The details are as follows:

Applicant No.	*Service Particular*	*Date of Enrolment*	*Date of discharge/ retirement and total service*	*Date of last increment*
1.	*902174-G Sgt (Retd) Ravi Kant*	*16.12.2002*	*31.12.2022 & 20 Yrs and 16 days*	*01.01.2022*
2.	*744443-H Sgt (Retd) Arun Vashishtha*	*16.12.2002*	*31.12.2022 & 20 Yrs and 16 days*	*01..01.2022*
3.	*744416-N Sgt (Retd) Ravi Ranjan Kumar*	*16.12.2002*	*31.12.2022 & 20 Yrsand 16 days*	*01.01.2022*
4.	*686439-B Sgt (Retd) Akhil Kumar Sarkar*	*18.06.10986*	*30.06.2018 & 29 Yrs and 12 days*	*01.07.2017*
5.	*901042-G Sgt (Retd) Tarun Shekhawat*	*10.04.1984*	*30.06.2022 & 20Yrs 14 days*	*01.07.2021*
6.	*901052A Sgt (Retd) Narender Singh*	*13.04.1983*	*30.06.2022 & 20 Yrs and 14 days*	*01.07.2021*

(b). Direct the respondent to pay the due arrears of pension with interest @ 12% p.a. from the date of retirement with all the consequential benefits."

3. The applicants was enrolled in the **Indian Air Force** and retired on different dates as mentioned in para (a) of the table above. The applicants submit that they were denied the benefit of increments, which were otherwise due to them only on the ground that by the time the increment became due, they were not in service though they completed one full year of service on the dates as mentioned in para (a) of the table. They were given their last annual increments and were denied increment that fell due on the dates as mentioned in para (a) on the ground that after the 6th Central Pay

Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July/1st January as the date of increment for all Government employees.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that after the 6th CPC submitted its report, the Government promulgated the acceptance of the recommendations with modifications through the Govt. Extraordinary Gazette Notification dated 29th August, 2008. This notification was also applicable to the Armed Forces personnel and implementation instructions for the respective Services clearly lay down that there will be a uniform date of annual increment, viz. 1st January/1st July of every year and that personnel completing six months and above in the revised pay structure as on the 1st day of January/July, will be eligible to be granted the increment. In this regard learned counsel for the applicant relied upon the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of ***P. Ayyamperumal*** *Vs.* ***The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench and Ors.*** (WP No.15732/2017) decided on 15th September, 2017 and the verdict of the Lucknow Regional Bench of the Armed Forces Tribunal in ***Ex Sgt Kapil Sharma*** *Vs.* ***Union of India and Ors.*** (OA 161/2021) decided on 27.05.2021. The Hon'ble High Court of Madras vide the said judgment referred to hereinabove held that the petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose.

5. The respondents fairly do not dispute the settled proposition of law put forth on behalf of the applicants in view of the verdicts relied upon on behalf of the applicant.

6. The law on 'notional increment' has already been laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of ***P. Ayyamperumal*** (supra) and in ***State of Tamil Nadu, rep. By its Secretary to Government, Finance Department and Others Vs. M. Balasubramaniam, reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525***, wherein vide paras 5, 6 and 7 of the said judgment it was observed to the effect:

> ***"5. The petitioner retired as Additional Director General, Chennai on 30.06.2013 on attaining the age of superannuation.***
>
> ***After the Sixth Pay Commission, the Central Government fixed 1st July as the date of increment for all employees by amending Rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008. In view of the said amendment, the petitioner was denied the last increment, though he completed a full one year in service, ie., from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013. Hence, the petitioner filed the original application in O.A.No.310/00917/2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was rejected on the ground that an incumbent is only entitled to increment on 1st July if he continued in service on that day.***
>
> ***6. In the case on hand, the petitioner got retired on 30.06.2013. As per the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008, the increment has to be given only on 01.07.2013, but he had been superannuated on 30.06.2013 itself. The judgment referred to by the petitioner in State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary to Government, Finance Department and others v. M.Balasubramaniam, reported in CDJ 2012 MHC 6525, was passed under similar circumstances on 20.09.2012, wherein this Court confirmed the order passed in W.P.No.8440 of 2011 allowing the writ petition filed by the employee, by observing that the employee had completed one full year of service from 01.04.2002 to 31.03.2003, which entitled him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period.***

7. The petitioner herein had completed one full year service as on 30.06.2013, but the increment fell due on 01.07.2013, on which date he was not in service. In view of the above judgment of this Court, naturally he has to be treated as having completed one full year of service, though the date of increment falls on the next day of his retirement. Applying the said judgment to the present case, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the first respondent-Tribunal dated 21.03.2017 is quashed. The petitioner shall be given one notional increment for the period from 01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013, as he has completed one full year of service, though his increment fell on 01.07.2013, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose. No costs."

7. The issue raised in this OA is squarely covered by the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in Civil Appeal No. 2471 of 2023 decided on 11.04.2023 titled as ***Director (Admn. And HR) KPTCL and Others*** Vs. ***C.P. Mundinamani and Others*** (2023) SCC Online SC 401.

8. Thus, as the issue referred to under consideration in the present OA is no longer ***res integra*** in view of the SLP (Civil) Dy No.22283/2018 against the judgment dated 15th September, 2017 of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of ***P. Ayyamperumal*** (Supra) having been dismissed vide order dated 23rd July, 2018 and in view of the order dated 19.05.2023 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***SLP (C) No. 4722 of 2021) Union of India & Anr vs M.I. Siddaraj,*** the OA is allowed.

9. The respondents are thus, directed to:

(a) grant one notional increment to the applicants for the period mentioned in Col. 2 of the table below subject to

verification that they have completed one full year of service for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose:

1	*2*
Sgt (Retd) Ravi Kant	***01.01.2022 to 31.12.2022***
Sgt (Retd) Arun Vashishtha	***01.01.2022 to 31.12.2022***
Sgt (Retd) Ravi Ranjan Kumar	***01.01.2022 to 31.12.2022***
Sgt (Retd) Akhil Kumar Sarkar	***01.07.2017 to 30.06.2018***
Sgt (Retd) Tarun Shekhawat	***01.07.2021 to 30.06.2022***
Sgt (Retd) Narender Singh	***01.07.2021 to 30.06.2022***

(b) issue fresh corrigendum PPOs to the applicants accordingly subject to their fulfilling other conditions which are applicable;

(c) give effect to this order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. The arrears that become due shall be paid without interest.

10. Even though in all the cases we have been following and passing aforesaid order but recently it has come to our notice that in certain cases applicants have been granted increment and before completing the period of one year, they are again claiming the subsequent increment as well. Grant of benefit of notional increment, as directed hereinabove, shall be subject to the condition

that the applicant has completed one full year of service after drawal of the earlier/last increment.

11. There shall be no order as to costs.



[JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON]
CHAIRPERSON



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

/vks/

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

65.

MA 1575/2025 IN OA 1841/2024

Union of India & Ors. .... Applicants/Respondents
Versus
Ex Sgt Ravi Kant (Retd) & Ors .... Respondent/Applicant

For Applicants/Respondents : Mr. A S Mathur, Advocate
For Respondent/Applicant : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM

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

ORDER
17.04.2025

MA 1575/2025

This is an application filed by the applicants-UoI (respondents in OA) seeking modification/correction of order dated 29.05.2024 in OA 1841/2024 to the extent that the appearance on behalf of the respondents on 29.05.2024 in OA 1841/2024 has wrongly been recorded. The name of the counsel for the respondents 'Sqn Ldr A.K. Nautiyal' as mentioned in the order dated 29.05.2024 is not correct. The name of the counsel who appeared for the respondents is Mr. 'A.S. Mathur' and in the order dated 29.05.2024 his name is to be shown as counsel for the respondents.

2. In view of the above, we allow this application and direct that the name of the counsel for the respondents shall now be read as 'A.S. Mathur' in place of "Sqn Ldr A.K.

Nautiyal' wherever it appears in the order dated 29.05.2024 in OA 1841/2024.

3. This order shall form part of the order dated 29.05.2024 in OA 1841/2024.

4. Accordingly, the MA stands disposed of.

[JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON]
CHAIRPERSON

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

/Ps/