

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

OA No. 1621 of 2023 WITH MA 2387/2023

Smt. Shaik Mahaboobi

Widow of Late Sep Sahik Khasim

... Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

.... Respondents

For Applicant : Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta, Advocate

For Respondents : Ms. Kumar Gaurav, Advocate

CORAM:

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

ORDER

1. Invoking the jurisdiction of this Tribunal under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as 'AFT Act'), the applicant has filed this OA and the reliefs claimed in Para 8 read as under:

"In view of the above, it is therefore, most respectfully prayed, the Hon'ble Tribunal may please to direct the respondents: -

A. To direct the respondents to declare applicant's late husband entitled for disability or invalid pension @ 30% duly broad-banded to 50% wef the date of his

being invalidated out from the service on medical ground till his death and/or

B. Grant Family Pension to the Applicant (in lieu of Invalid Pension comprising both service as well as disability element) wef the date of death of her husband by declaring invalidating disability attributable and aggravated to military service in terms of judgments placed as Annex-A6 & 7; and or,

C. Pass an appropriate order/ direction to notionally fix the amount of Family Pension, payable to the husband of the applicant wef the date of his discharge from service by considering applicant's husband will be deemed to be a pensioner on the date of his death; and/or

D. The respondents are required to be further directed to sanction and pay the entitled SFP, on the basis of the entitlement of Disability Pension payable to her husband and/or pass any other order/relief as may be deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."

BRIEF FACTS

2. The husband of the applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 29.04.1995 and was invalidated out from service under item III (iii) annexed to Army Rule 13 (3) of Army Rules 1954 with disease '**SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS**' at 30% for

life on 18.03.2003 after having served around 07 years 10 months and 19 days of military service.

3. As per the IMB vide AFMSF-16, dated 19.02.2003, at the time of discharge, the husband of the applicant was found in Low Medical Category (LMC) S1H1A1P5E1 for the disease '**SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS**' which was assessed at 30% and conceded as Neither Attributable to Nor Aggravated (NANA) by the military service.

4. The husband of the applicant after being invalided out from service on 18.03.2003 due to the disease '**SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS**' died on 25.03.2004 as per the Death Certificate issued by the Government of Karnataka which is annexed as '*Annexure A-2 Colly*' to the OA.

5. The initial claim of the deceased husband of the applicant for the grant of disability pension was rejected by the Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension) Allahabad vide their Letter No. G-3/54/198/7-03 dated 16.02.2004 stating that the invaliding disease of the applicant is neither attributable to nor aggravated by the military service. The rejection of the claim for the grant of disability pension was forwarded to the applicant by the respondents

vide letter No. 15316812/Pen(D)/41 dated 04.03.2004 annexed as 'Annexure A-1 (Colly)' to the OA.

6. The applicant filed an appeal dated 24.02.2023 and appeal cum legal notice dated 27.03.2023 seeking the grant of family pension which was replied by the respondents vide letter no. 15314812/Pen(f) dated 20.06.2023 informing the applicant qua establishing of her eligibility and fulfilment of necessary documentation for the grant of Family Pension.

7. Aggrieved by the decision of the respondents, the applicant has filed the instant OA. In the interest of justice, in accordance with Section 21(1) of the AFT Act, we take up the present OA.

CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

8. The applicant, through this OA, is seeking for the grant of either Disability Pension or Invalid Pension for her deceased husband specifically vide prayer clause 8 A and thereafter Family Pension for herself among other prayer clause(s). Qua the prayer for the grant of Disability Pension or Invalid Pension to the deceased husband of the applicant, during the course of hearing today, i.e., on 30.04.2025, the learned counsel for the

applicant sought to confine the prayer made in the said clause for seeking the grant of Invalid Pension only.

9. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the husband of the applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 29.04.1995. and was invalided out from service on 18.03.2003 in LMC (Permanent) under item III (iii) annexed to Army Rule 13 (3) of Army Rules 1954 due to the invaliding disease '**SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS**'.

10. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant was enrolled into military service after thorough medical examination and there was no note of any disability recorded in his service records and that the applicant contracted the invaliding disease '**SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS**' during the service and any disability contracted at the time of service is deemed to be attributable to or aggravated by the military service.

11. The learned counsel for the applicant has placed reliance on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Dharamvir Singh Vs. Union of India and Ors.** [2013 (7) SCC 36], that after thorough medical examination the applicant was enrolled into military service and there was no

note of any disability recorded in his service records. Therefore, any disability occurring during the period of his service is deemed to be attributable to or aggravated by military service.

12. The learned counsel for the applicant placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case no. CA-5605/2010 titled **Sukhvinder Singh v. Union of India** (2014 STPL (web) 468 SC) decided on 25.06.2014, wherein it was held that any disability not recorded at the time of recruitment must be presumed to have been caused subsequently and unless proved to the contrary to be a consequence of military service.

13. The learned counsel for the applicant has further placed reliance on the Order of the AFT, RB Chandigarh in the **OA 469 of 2019** titled **Smt. Shanti Devi v. Union of India and Others**, decided on 17.01.2022 wherein the AFT, RB, Chandigarh had allowed and granted Disability Pension to the deceased husband of the applicant and thereby granted Ordinary Family Pension to the widow of the deceased soldier i.e., the applicant Smt. Shanti Devi.

14. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the deceased husband of the applicant was invalided out of service w.e.f. 18.03.2003 under item III (iii) of the table annexed to Rule 13 (3) of Army Rules 1954 with invaliding disease '**SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS**' assessed at @ 30% for life which was conceded as Neither Attributable to Nor Aggravated (NANA) by the military service by the IMB held on 19.02.2003 stating the disease being constitutional in nature and thereby rejected the claim for Disability Pension vide letter No. G-3/54/198/7-03 dated 16.02.2004.

15. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that since the invaliding disease of the deceased husband of the applicant was conceded as 'NANA by the military service' by the medical board, the deceased husband of the applicant did not satisfy the twin conditions as enumerated in Para 173 of the Pension Regulations for the Army (Part-1) 1961 (hereinafter 'PRA') and hence was not granted Disability Pension. Para 173 of the PRA 1961 reads to the effect:

"Unless otherwise specifically provided a disability pension consisting of service element and disability"

*element may be granted to an individual who is
invalided out of service on account of disability which
is attributable to or aggravated by military service in
non-battle casualty and is assessed at 20% or over."*

16. The learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that though the deceased husband of the applicant was not eligible for the grant of Disability/Invalid Pension, however, a sum of Rupees 45,264/- (Forty-Five Thousand Two Hundred and Sixty-Four only) as Invaliding Gratuity, as provided in Annexure R-1 annexed to the Counter Affidavit filed on 07.03.2024, has been paid to the applicant.

ANALYSIS

17. *Prima facie*, it is not in dispute that the applicant was invalided out from service on medical grounds with the disease/disability **'SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS'** assessed at @ 30% for life, in LMC (Permanent) before completion of terms of engagement after having served around 07 years 10 months and 22 days in the military service.

18. After perusal of the records produced before us and arguments advanced by either side, we hold that the applicant is entitled to invalid pension, as the applicant was enrolled in

the Army on 29.04.1995 and was invalided out from service on medical grounds on 18.03.2003 i.e., after rendering around 07 years 10 months and 19 days of military service, which in our view is deemed invaliding from service. In this regard, reliance is placed upon Rule 197 of the Pension Regulation for the Army, 1961 (Part-1) which is reproduced herein below:

“197. Invalid pension/gratuity shall be admissible in accordance with the Regulations in this chapter, to

(a) an individual who is invalided out of service on account of a disability which is neither attributable to nor aggravated by service;

(b) an individual who is though invalided out of service on account of a disability which is attributable to or aggravated service, but the disability is assessed at less than 20%, and

(c) a low medical category individual who is retired/discharged from service for lack of alternative employment compatible with his low medical category.”

19. Lest it be contended that the applicant being invalided out after serving around 04 years, however may not be eligible for getting the invalid pension as per Rule 198 of the Pension Regulation for the Army, 1961, which reads as under:

“ 198. The minimum period of qualifying service actually rendered and required for grant of invalid pension is 10 years. For less than 10 years actual qualifying service invalid gratuity shall be admissible.”

It is apposite to mention the order of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Regional Bench) Lucknow in **Ex. Recruit. Chhote Lal Vs. Union of India & Ors.** in OA No.368 of 2021, wherein the MoD letter No. 12(06)/2019/D(Pen-Pol) dated 16.07.2020 has been examined in detail. The said MoD letter is reproduced below:

“Subject: Provision of Invalid Pension to Armed Forces Personnel before completion of 10 years of qualifying service- Reg.

Sir,

1. Government of India, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & pensions, Department of Pension & Pensioners, Welfare vide their O.M 21/01/2016-P&PW(F) dated 12th February 2019 has provided that a government servant, who retires from service on account of any bodily or mental infirmity which permanently incapacitates him from the service before completing qualifying service of ten years, may also be granted invalid pension subject to certain conditions.

The provisions have been based on Government of India, Gazette Notification No. 21/1/2016- P&PW(F) dated 04.01.2019.

2. The Proposal to extend the provisions of Department of Pension & Pensioners Welfare O.M No. 21/01/2016 -P&OW(F) dated 12.02.2019 to Armed Forces personnel has been under consideration of this Ministry. The undersigned is directed to state that invalid Pension would henceforth also be admissible to Armed Forces Personnel with less than 10 years of qualifying service in cases where personnel are invalided out of service on account of any bodily or mental infirmity which is Neither Attributable to Nor Aggravated by Military Service and which permanently incapacities them from military service as well as civil reemployment.

3. Pension Regulation of the Services will be amended in due course.

4. The provision of this letter shall apply to those Armed Forces Personnel were / are in service on or after 04.01.2019. The Cases in respect of personnel who were invalided out from service before 04.01.2019 will not be re-opened.

5. All other terms and conditions shall remain unchanged.

The AFT, Regional Bench, Lucknow Bench while disposing off the OA No. 368 of 2021 has examined Para 4 of the MoD letter dated 16.07.2020 and has held the said Para 4 of the letter as unconstitutional on the grounds that:

“ 20...

letter dated 16.07.2020 fails to meet the aforesaid twin test. The letter arbitrarily denies the benefit of invalid pension to those armed forces personnel, who happened to be invalided out from service prior to 04.01.2020. There cannot be any difference on the ground of invalidment as both in the cases of personnel invalided out before and after 04.01.2020, they faced the similar consequences. In fact, the persons who have retired prior to 04.01.2020 have faced more difficulties as compared to the persons invalided out on or after 04.01.2020. The longer period of suffering cannot be a ground to deny the benefit by way of a policy, which is supposed to be beneficial. Such a provision amounts to adding salt to injury.

21. ...

22. As per policy letter of Govt. of India, Ministry of Def dated 16.07.2020, there is a cut of date for grant of invalid pension. As per para 4 of policy letter, “provision of this letter

shall apply to those Armed Forces Personnel who were/ are in service on or after 04.01.2019". Para 4 of impugned policy letter dated 16.07.2020 is thus liable to be quashed being against principles of natural justice as such discrimination has been held to be ultra vires by the Hon'ble Apex Court because the introduction of such cut of date fails the test of reasonableness of classification prescribed by the Hon'ble Apex Court viz (i) that the classification must be founded on an intelligible differentia which distinguishes persons or things that are grouped together from those that are left out of the group; and (ii) that differentia must have a rational relation to the objects sought to be achieved by the statute in question.

23. From the foregoing discussions, it may be concluded that the policy pertaining to invalid pension vide letter date 16.07.2020 will be applicable in the case of the applicant also as para 4 of the letter cannot discriminate against the petitioner based on a cut of date.

....."

20. Significantly vide judgment dated 07.01.2025 of the Hon'ble Division Bench of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana in CWP 28442/2023 in **Union of India & Ors. v. No.**

8994857B Ex. AC UT Sandeep Kumar and Anr. the cut-off

date of 04.01.2019 for grant of invalid pension only to those who **'were/are in service on or after 04.01.2019'** vide the MOD letter dated 16.07.2020 bearing reference no. 12(06)/2019/D(Pen/Pol) has been observed to be arbitrary not being based on any intelligible differentia with no nexus to the objects thereto, as observed under Para 14 of the said judgment which reads to the effect: -

"14. Conspicuously also when the prescription as made in Annexure P-4, contents whereof become extracted hereinafter, thus on plain reading thereof, after making relaxations in the period of rendition of service, yet makes a cut-off date, vis-a-vis, the applications thereof. However, the prescriptions therein vis-a-vis the apposite cut-off date for the benefits thereof becoming assigned to the concerned, but also is rather arbitrary. The reason for so concluding stems from the factum that since the soldier qua whom the benefits of Annexure P-4, become purveyed when do constitute a homogeneous in-segregable class. Resultantly each member of the homogeneous class was to be co equally endowed the benefits of Annexure P-4. Therefore, the segregations created through Annexure P-4, thus amongst the same class, rather through the makings therein of a cut-off date, and that too when the said cut-off date, is not based on

any intelligible differentia nor when it has any nexus with the beneficent thereto objects, but are required to be discountenanced.

“4. The provision of this letter shall apply to those Armed Forces Personnel who were/are in service on or after 04.01.2019. The cases in respect of personnel who were invalided out from service before 04.01.2019 will not be re-opened.”

21. To this effect, reliance is also placed on para 27 of the order of **Lt. A.K. Thapa v. Union of India & Ors. in OA 2240/2019**, Para 27 reads as under: -

“...

27. In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sukhvinder Singh v. Union of India (2014 STPL (WEB) 468 decided on 25.06.2014 (Supra)** and in **Balbir Singh (Supra)** on invalidment, the personnel of the Armed Forces who is invalided out is presumed to have been so invalided out with a minimum of twenty percent disability which in terms of the verdict in **Sukhvinder Singh (Supra)** is to be broad-banded to 50% for life, the incorporation by

the respondents vide the MoD letter dated 16.07.2020 of a term of **a necessary permanent incapacity for civil re-employment**, is an apparent overreach on the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sukhvinder Singh (Supra)**. Furthermore, the said clause of a requirement of an Armed Forces Personnel to be permanently incapacitated from Military service as well as Civil re-employment is wholly vague and arbitrary and does not take into account the extent of incapacity for Civil reemployment. This is so for the personnel of the Armed Forces who is invalided out with all limbs incapacitated may still have a functional brain and functional voice, may be able to speak, sing, paint and earn a livelihood. The utilization of the words 'permanently incapacitates from civil re-employment, apparently requires a permanent brain-dead armed forces personnel. We thus hold that the requirement of the Armed Forces Personnel 'to be permanently incapacitated from civilian employment as well' (apart from permanent incapacitation from military service) for the grant of invalid pension in terms of the MoD

letter No. 12(06) /2019 /D (Pen/Pol) dated 16.07.2020 to be wholly arbitrary and unconstitutional and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India which is in Part-III of the Fundamental Rights with the sub heading thereto of 'Right to Equality', and lays down to the effect:-

"14. Equality before law - The State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India.

Article 21 of the Constitution of India lays down to the effect: -

"21. Protection of life and personal liberty - No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law."

22. It is essential to observe that, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court vide judgment dated 26.11.2024 in **W.P.(C) 13577/2024** titled **Lt. A K Thappa vs. Union of India and Ors.**, in the matter of **NO 40634Z LT A K THAPA (RELEASED) v. UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**, arising out of the decision of this Tribunal in **OA No. No. 2240 of 2019** has upheld the decision of this Tribunal, for the grant of invalid pension to the

applicant, vide Paras 25 and 29 of the Judgment. Paras 25 and 29 of the said judgment respectively read as follows:

“25. The learned AFT also referred to the answers provided by the Commanding Officer of INS Virbahu, Visakhapatnam on 21.09.1982 and found that since 10.02.1982, the petitioner had been performing ‘Sedentary Duties Ashore’ and he was not assigned to a submarine or sailing duties. The learned AFT took note of responses of the said Commanding Officer, stating that petitioner’s disability was neither attributable to nor aggravated by service. It also noted the response of IMB proceedings of March, 1982, that the petitioner’s disability existed before entering the service, thus referring to all of the above, the learned AFT concluded that petitioner’s disability cannot be held to be attributable to nor aggravated by Military service in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case. The learned AFT, thus, passed a detailed and reasoned Order after noting all the submissions of the parties, the decisions cited before it, as well as the documents produced for its perusal and consequently, granted Invalid Pension to the petitioner, however, not the Disability element of Pension.”

“29. In light of these circumstances, we are constrained to hold that there is no infirmity in the Impugned Order passed by the learned AFT and it would not be appropriate for this Court to interfere with the order passed by it, specifically when the order passed is well reasoned.”

23. Furthermore, vide judgment ***dated 11.12.2024*** of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, W.P. (C) 17139/2024, filed by the Union of India, to assail the ***order dated 07.07.2023 in OA 2240/2019 in Lt. AK Thapa (Released) v. Union of India and Ors.*** has been dismissed, in view of leave to appeal having been granted by this Tribunal vide order dated 17.05.2024 in OA 1721/2024 with MA No. 34608-4609/2023 to assail the order dated 07.07.2023 in OA 2240/2019. The observations in Para 6-11 of the Hon'ble HC of Delhi in W.P. (C) 17139/2024 are to the effect: -

"6. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on advance notice, submits that by an Order dated 17.05.2024 passed in M.A. 1721/2024 with M.A Nos. 4608-4609/2023 passed in the above OA by the learned AFT, leave has been granted to the petitioners to assail the Order dated 07.07.2023 passed in the above OA before the Supreme Court.

7. Placing reliance on Section 31(3) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 (in short, „AFT Act”), he submits that once leave is granted, the appeal is deemed to be pending before the Supreme Court. He submits that, therefore, this Court should not exercise its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to examine the plea raised by the petitioners.

8. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

9. Section 31 of the AFT Act reads as under: -

"31. Leave to appeal.— (1) An appeal to the Supreme Court shall lie with the leave of the Tribunal; and such leave shall not be granted unless it is certified by the Tribunal that a point of law of general public importance is involved in the decision, or it appears to the Supreme Court that the point is one which ought to be considered by that Court.

(2) An application to the Tribunal for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court shall be made within a period of thirty days beginning with the date of the decision of the Tribunal and an application to the Supreme Court for leave shall be made within a period of thirty days beginning with the date on which the application for leave is refused by the Tribunal.

(3) An appeal shall be treated as pending until any application for leave to appeal is disposed of and if leave to appeal is granted, until the appeal is disposed of; and an application for leave to appeal shall be treated as disposed of at the expiration of the time within which it might have been made, but it is not made within that time.

10. Sub Section (3) of Section 31 of the AFT Act, creates a deeming fiction providing that if the leave to appeal is granted by the learned AFT, until the appeal is disposed of, such appeal shall be treated to be pending before the Supreme Court.

11. In the present case, the effect of the Order dated 17.05.2024 passed by the learned AFT, therefore, shall be that the appeal filed by the petitioners to challenge the Order dated

***07.07.2023 is pending before the Supreme Court.
There cannot be two alternate remedies
simultaneously taken by the petitioners to
challenge the same order."***

There is no stay granted so far by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of the operation of the order dated 07.07.2023 in OA 2240/2019 of the Tribunal, in ***Lt. AK Thapa (Released) (Supra)***.

24. We find no reason to differ from the law laid down in ***Chhote Lal (supra)*** and in ***A.K. Thapa (supra)***, and we are therefore of the considered view that the applicant was deemed to be invalided out of service on account of the disease '***SECONDARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS***' as the applicant rendered 07 years 10 months and 19 days of military service and was invalided out from the Indian Army on medical grounds before completing his term of initial engagement. Therefore, the applicant is held entitled to invalid pension, despite the fact that he had not completed the qualifying length of service of ten years.

**Considerations w.r.t the issue of Grant of Family Pension
to the Applicant**

25. Qua the prayer of the applicant for the grant of Family Pension w.e.f. date of death of her husband, this Court, vide Order dated 30.01.2025, had asked the respondents as to why Family Pension to the applicant cannot be granted. In pursuance of the Order dated 30.01.2025, the respondents had produced a communication letter dated 20.02.2025 before this Court during the course of proceedings on 06.03.2025.

26. Vide the said communication letter dated 20.02.2025, it is submitted that the respondents had erroneously issued Family Pension claim forms to the applicant vide their letter no. 15314812/Pen(f) dated 20.06.2023 (annexed as 'Annexure R-2' to the Counter Affidavit filed on 07.03.2024) in mistake of fact, i.e., that the invaliding disease of the deceased husband of the applicant was aggravated by the military service and that it was rejected by the Medical Advisor (Pension) at PCDA, Prayagraj. It was further submitted by the said communication letter that in pursuance to this erroneous communication to the applicant, the applicant submitted the documents through Zilla Sainik Welfare Office, Guntur, vide their letter no. 780/F.P/A1 dated 02.05.2024 and the respondents had processed the claim to the PAO (OR) MEG & Centre Bangalore

for audit of Family Pension to the applicant w.e.f. next date of the demise of husband of the applicant, i.e., 26.03.2004, however, the same could not be processed as it was found that the deceased husband of the applicant was not in receipt of any kind of pension and hence applicant is also not eligible for Family Pension.

27. Qua the prayer of the applicant for the grant of Family Pension, it is essential to advert to **Regulation 212 of the Pension Regulations for the Army, 1961 (Part-1)** (hereinafter 'PRA'). **Regulation 212 under clause 2 sub clause (ii)** of the Pension Regulations for the Army, 1961 (Part-1) provides for the circumstances under which Ordinary Family Pension is admissible after retirement/discharge of the PBORs. Regulation 212 of the PRA reads as under: -

*"2. Ordinary Family Pension When admissible.
When an individual dies on account of causes,
which are neither attributable to nor aggravated
by Military Service.*

- (i) either while in service provided, he had been found fit after successful completion of the requisite training and medical examination for commission or at the time of enrolment in the case of personnel below officer rank.*
- (ii) or after retirement/discharge from services and was on the date of death in receipt of or eligible for*

retiring/special/Reservist/disability/invalid/War injury pension.

- (iii) *Death due to suckle does not disqualify the heir from ordinary family pension."*

28. In the instant case, since the husband of the applicant was invalided out on medical grounds under item III (iii) of the table annexed to Rule 13 (3) of Army Rules 1954 i.e., 'having been found medically unfit for further service' (Annexure A-3 Colly) and at the time of discharge, he was found *unfit* due to low medical category, the husband of the applicant was eligible for the grant of invalid pension at the time of invalidment and has been adjudicated qua the grant of invalid pension as brought forth in Para 24 hereinabove, and therefore the applicant in accordance with **sub-clause (ii) clause 2 of Regulation 212 of Pension Regulations for the Army 1961** is also held entitled for the grant of Ordinary Family Pension from the next date of the death of her husband i.e., 26.03.2004.

29. It is thus apparent that the contention raised by the respondents vide their communication letter dated 20.02.2025 that as the deceased was not in receipt of any pension, the

applicant too was not entitled to Family Pension has to be negated.

CONCLUSION

30. In view of the above analysis, the OA is allowed. The deceased husband of the applicant is thus held entitled for the grant of Invalid Pension w.e.f. date of his invalidment i.e., 18.03.2003. Accordingly, the applicant is held entitled for the grant of Ordinary Family Pension w.e.f. the next date of the demise of her husband, i.e., 26.03.2004.

31. The respondents are thus directed to calculate, sanction and issue the necessary PPO to the applicant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order and the amount of arrears for the grant of Invalid Pension and Ordinary Family Pension shall be paid by the respondents, after adjusting the amount already paid towards Death Cum Retirement Gratuity/Invalid Gratuity (as provided in Annexure R-1) failing which the applicant will be entitled for interest @6% p.a. from the date of receipt of copy of the order by the respondents. However, the arrears of the Invalid Pension be paid and Ordinary Family Pension are restricted to commence to run

from 03 (three) years prior to the date of filing of this OA i.e.,
16.06.2023.

32. Consequently, Miscellaneous Application(s) if any,
stands disposed of accordingly.

Pronounced in the open Court on this ²⁸ day of May,
2025.

[JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON]
CHAIRPERSON

[REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG]
MEMBER (A)

/PRGx/