

COURT NO. 2  
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

3.

OA 1168/2025

IC-65932-A Col Amit Issar	.....	Applicant
Versus		
Union of India & Ors.	.....	Respondents
For Applicant	:	Mr. Prashant Negi & Ms Shruti Rawat, Advocates
For Respondents	:	Ms. Sunanda Shukla, Advocate

CORAM

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA, MEMBER(J)

HON'BLE LT GEN C.P. MOHANTY, MEMBER (A)

ORDER  
29.04.2025

The applicant IC-65932-A Col Amit Issar vide the present OA filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 makes the following prayers:

- (a) *Call for the records wherein the Respondents have fixed the pay of the Applicant in the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC in the Rank of Lt. wef 01.01.2006 and thereafter despite repeated directions, the Respondents have not rectified the fixation of the pay of the applicant in the Rank of Capt. which was more beneficial to him at the time of 6<sup>th</sup> CPC and thereafter quash the same.*
- (b) *Issue further direction to the respondents to re-fix the pay of the applicant in the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC from the date of*

*promotion as Capt. on 06.05.2006 in 6<sup>th</sup> CPC in a manner that is more beneficial to the Applicant with further direction to fix the pay of the applicant on further promotion to the Rank of Major as well as Lt.Col and also on the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC based on such fixation of pay in a more beneficial manner.*

- (c) Direct the respondents to pay the difference of pay after all necessary adjustments as arrears on all such fixation with a penal interest @18% in a time bound manner.*
- (d) Pass any other order/orders as deemed appropriate by this Hon'ble Tribunal in the facts and circumstances of the present case."*

2. The applicant was commissioned in the Indian Army on 06.09.2003 after having been found fit. On 06.05.2006, when the recommendations of the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC were yet to be implemented, the applicant was promoted to the rank of Capt. The implementation instructions for 6<sup>th</sup> CPC were issued vide SAI/02/S/2008 in the case of officers. However, because of the wrong fixation of pay, his pay was fixed much lower than his juniors on account of the fact that the applicant had not exercised the option of how his pay was to be fixed on promotion during the transition period of 01.01.2006 to 11.10.2008 within the stipulated time and many officers including the applicant were denied the benefit

of fixation of the pay in the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC from the date of promotion i.e. 06.05.2006 which was more beneficial instead of w.e.f. 01.01.2006 and thus his pay was fixed in the rank of Lt. wef. 01.01.2006 at Rs.15,600/- causing a financial loss of Rs.2,000/-p.m. and on further promotion to the rank of Major on 06.05.2010 such pay disparity continued due to initial wrong fixation of pay during the transition period of the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC. The applicant further submits that despite the repeated request, the respondents did not accept his request for fixation of pay in a manner that is more beneficial only on the ground of not exercising the option within the stipulated period of time i.e. 30.06.2011.

3. We have examined numerous cases pertaining to the incorrect pay fixation in 6<sup>th</sup> CPC in respect of Officers/JCOs/ORs merely on the grounds of option not being exercised in the stipulated time or applicants not exercising the option at all, and have issued orders that in all these cases the petitioners' pay is to be re-fixed with the most beneficial option as stipulated in Para 12 of the SAI 2/S/2008 dated 11.10.2008. The matter of incorrect pay-fixation and providing the most beneficial option in the case of JCOs/ORs has been exhaustively examined in the case of Sub M.L.

Shrivastava and Ors Vs. Union of India [O.A No.1182 of 2018] decided on 03.09.2021.

4. Similarly, in the matter of incorrect pay fixation in the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC, the issue has been exhaustively examined in Sub Ramjeevan Kumar Singh Vs. Union of India [O.A. No.2000/2021] decided on 27.09.2021. Relevant portions are extracted below:

“12. Notwithstanding the absence of the option clause in 7<sup>th</sup> CPC, this Bench has repeatedly held that a soldier cannot be drawing less pay than his junior, or be placed in a pay scale/band which does not offer the most beneficial pay scale, for the only reason that the soldier did not exercise the required option for pay fixation, or exercised it late. We have no hesitation in concluding that even under the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC, it remains the responsibility of the Respondents; in particular the PAO (OR), to ensure that a soldier's pay is fixed in the most beneficial manner.

13. In view of the foregoing, we allow the OA and direct the Respondents to:-

(a) Take necessary action to amend the Extraordinary Gazette Notification NO SRO 9E dated 03.05.2017 and include a suitable 'most beneficial' option clause, similar to the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC. A Report to be submitted within three months of this order.

(b) Review the pay fixed of the applicant on his promotion to Naib Subedar in the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC, and after due verification re-fix his pay in a manner that is most beneficial to the applicant, while ensuring that he does not draw less pay than his juniors.

(c) Issue all arrears within three months of this order and submit a compliance report.

(d) Issue all arrears within three months of this order and submit a compliance report.”

5. In respect of officers, the cases pertaining to pay-anomaly have also been examined in detail by the Tribunal in the case of Lt Col Karan Dusad Vs. Union of India and others [O.A. No.868 of 2020 and connected matters] decided on 05.08.2022. In that case, we have directed CGDA/CDA(O) to issue necessary instructions to review pay-

fixation of all officers of all the three Services, whose pay has been fixed on 01.01.2006 in 6<sup>th</sup> CPC and provide them the most beneficial option. Relevant extracts are given below:

"102 (a) to (j) xxx

(k) *The pay fixation of all the officers, of all the three Services (Army, Navy and Air Force), whose pay has been fixed as on 01.01.2006 merely because they did not exercise an option/ exercised it after the stipulated time be reviewed by CGDA/ CDA(O), and the benefit of the most beneficial option be extended to these officers, with all consequential benefits, including to those who have retired. The CGDA to issue necessary instructions for the review and implementation.*

Directions

103. xxx

104. *We, however, direct the CGDA/CDA(O) to review and verify the pay fixation of all those officers, of all the three Services (Army, Navy and Air Force), whose pay has been fixed as on 01.01.2006, including those who have retired, and re-fix their pay with the most beneficial option, with all consequential benefits, including re-fixing of their pay in the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC and pension wherever applicable. The CGDA to issue necessary instructions for this review and its implementation. Respondents are directed to complete this review and file a detailed compliance report within four months of this order."*

6. In the light of the above considerations, the OA 1168/2025 is allowed and direct the respondents to:

(a) Review the pay fixed of the applicant on his promotion to the rank of Capt. on 06.05.2006 in the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC and further promotion to the rank of Major on 06.05.2010 and after due verification re-fix his pay in a manner that is most beneficial to the applicant.

(b) Thereafter, re-fix the applicant's pay on transition to 7<sup>th</sup> CPC and subsequent promotion(s) in a most beneficial manner.

(c) To pay the arrears within three months of this order.

7. No order as to costs.

[JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA  
MEMBER(J)]

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

/Chanana/