

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

47.

OA 472/2023 with MA 702/2023

Sgt Prasoon Kumar Singh (Retd) & Ors. .... Applicant  
Versus  
Union of India & Ors. .... Respondents

For Applicant : Mr. Tatsat Shukla, Advocate for  
Mr. R Kaviya & Dhiraj Kumar, Advocates  
For Respondents : Mr. Kumar Gaurav, Advocate

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON, CHAIRPERSON  
HON'BLE REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG, MEMBER (A)

ORDER  
29.07.2024

MA 702/2023

By this application filed under Rule 4(5) of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules 2008, the applicants seek to file one OA for redressal of their grievances. For the averments made in the application and in the interest of justice, we allow this application and applicants are permitted to file one single application.

MA stands disposed off.

OA 472/2023

The applicants vide the present OA makes the following prayers:

*“(a) To set aside and quash the impugned orders attached as Annexure A-1 (Colly) passed by the respondents.*

*(b) To direct the respondents to grant a notional annual increment on the payment of the applicants as on completion of their service from 01 Jan 2022 to 31 Dec 2022 and re-fix their pension according to the increased pay.*

*(c) To direct the respondents to give arrears to the applicants @ 12% interest from the date of release from service.*

*(d) To direct the respondents to issue fresh/corrigendum PPO in respect of all applicants in accordance with increased pay after granting notional increment.*

*(e) To pass any other order or direction in favour of applicants which may be deemed just and proper under the facts and circumstances of this case in the interest of justice.*

2. Notice of the OA was issued to the respondents, which is accepted on their behalf.

3. The applicants were enrolled in the Indian Air Force on 16.12.2002 and discharged from service on 31.12.2022. The applicants submit that they were denied the benefit of increment, which was 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 in service as on 31.12.2022. They were given their last annual increment on 01.01.2022 and were denied increment that fell due on 01.01.2023 on the ground that after the 6<sup>th</sup> Central Pay

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

4. Learned counsel for the applicants contends that after the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC submitted its report, the Government promulgated the acceptance of the recommendations with modifications through the Govt. Extraordinary Gazette Notification 29.08.2008. 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. 1<sup>st</sup> January/1<sup>st</sup> July of every year and that personnel completing six months and above in the revised pay structure as on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of January/July, will be eligible to be granted the increment. In this regard learned counsel for the applicants 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 15.09.2017 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 petitioners 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 applicants.

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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 15.09.2017 of the

Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of P. Ayyamperumal (supra) having been dismissed vide order dated 23.07.2018 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. Siddaraj, the OA is allowed.

9. The respondents are thus, directed to:

- (a) grant one notional increment to the applicants for the period **01.01.2022 to 31.12.2022**, subject to verification that they have completed one full year of service, for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not for any other purpose;
- (b) issue fresh corrigendum PPO 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 till date 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 applicants had 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

[REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG]  
MEMBER (A)

/sm/