

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

14.

OA 1227/2025 with MA 1801/2025

778647-K Sgt Ashutosh Kumar
Shahi(Retd) Applicant
Versus
Union of India & Ors. Respondents

For Applicant : Mr. Nawneet Krishna Mishra,
Advocate
For Respondents : Wg.Cdr Manish Chandra, OIC, Legal

CORAM

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA, MEMBER(J)
HON'BLE LT.GEN. C.P. MOHANTY, MEMBER (A)

ORDER
29.04.2025

MA 1801/2025

This is an application filed under Section 22(2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 seeking condonation of delay of 633 days in filing the present OA. In view of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of *UoI & Ors Vs Tarsem Singh* 2009(1)AISLJ 371 and in *Ex Sep Chain Singh Vs Union of India & Ors* (Civil Appeal No. 30073/2017 and the reasons mentioned, the MA 1801/2025 is allowed and the delay of 633 days in filing the OA 1227/2025 is thus condoned. The MA is disposed of accordingly.

OA 1227/2025

The applicant 778647-K Sgt Ashutosh Kumar Shahi(Retd vide the present OA filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 makes the following prayers:

- (a) *"Review the pay fixed of the applicant under the 6th CPC w.e.f. 01.01.2006 and after due verification re-fix his pay in a manner that is most beneficial to him while ensuring that he is not drawing less pay than his course-mates/juniors.*
- (b) *Re-fix the applicant's pay in subsequent rank and thereafter on transition into 7th CPC in the most beneficial manner while ensuring that he is not drawing less pay than his course-mates/juniors including all subsequent increments.*
- (c) *To direct the respondents to pay 12% interest on the arrears accrue to the applicant.*
- (d) *To pass any other appropriate order or relief which this Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit and proper anytime during the proceedings of this case."*

2. The applicant 778647-K Sgt Ashutosh Kumar Shahi(Retd) after having been found fit was enrolled in the services of the Indian Air Force on 16.06.2003 in Group 'X' as 'AF Fit' trade and was promoted to the rank of LAC on 01.02.2006 and was further promoted to the rank of CPL on 23.06.2008 and to the rank of Sergeant(Sgt) on 23.06.2016. The grievance of the applicant is that his basic pay in the month ending June, 2023 was much lower i.e. Rs.46,800/- than his junior 912422-H Sgt Sumit Ranjan Das, AF Fit for the month ending June, 2023 i.e. Rs.48,200/- and to remove such pay anomalies, he sent a legal notice on 16.11.2023 to the respondent but the same has not been replied till date. The applicant has relied upon the order of the Armed Forces Tribunal(PB) dated 28.08.2023 passed in the case of *Sgt. Ram Pravesh Kumar Vs Union of India & Ors.* in OA 1390/2023 wherein the similarly placed applicant has been granted stepping up pay at par to his coursemate and junior and a catena of other orders of the

Armed Forces Tribunal. The applicant further relied upon the judgment dated 03.01.2014 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case of *Tejbir Singh Dagar Vs Union of India & Ors* (WP(C) No.7840/2012 and the judgment dated 17.12.1996 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in the case of *Union of India & Ors Vs P Jagdish and Ors*(SLP(C) No.020470/1995 wherein also similarly circumstanced applicant (s) have been granted the stepping of pay at par to their junior.

3. In *P. Jagdish* case (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that the principle of stepping up prevents violation of the principle of "equal pay for equal work". Applying the same principle of law here, a service personnel in the same rank cannot be allowed to draw a salary higher than his batchmate because that would be against the ethos of Article 39(d) of the Constitution which envisages the principle of "equal pay for equal work". Hence granting of stepping up is the only way out to remove the said anomaly, which

results in a service personnel drawing a higher salary in the same rank than his batchmate. The only way to remove this anomaly is the stepping up of the salary of aggrieved personnel at par with other service personnel in the same rank. The rules and provisions which allow the said anomaly to exist and prohibit the stepping up are violative of the principle of natural justice and equity; and contrary to Article 39(d) of the Constitution which envisages "equal pay for equal work" and contrary to the principle of law laid down by the Apex Court in its pronouncements.

4. Furthermore, it is essential to observe that the order dated 03.09.2021 in OA 1182/2018 in case of *Sub Mahendra Lal Shrivastava(Retd) v Union of India & Ors.* and two other connected matters in OA 1314/2018 in *Sub Sattaru Lakshmana Rao v Union of India & Ors.* and OA 892/2019 in *Sub(TIFC) Jaya Prakash v Union of India & Ors.* has been upheld by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide judgment dated 05.05.2025 in WP(C) 5880/2025 in *UOI & Ors. vs. Sub*

24 and 25 thereof to the effect:-

"24. There are various reasons why, in our view, this writ petition cannot succeed:

(i) Firstly, the writ petition has been preferred more than 3½ years after the passing of the impugned judgment, without even a whisper of justification for the delay.

(ii) The writ petition is, therefore, liable to be rejected even on delay and laches. Nonetheless, as the issue is recurring in nature, we have examined it on merits.

(iii) It appears that the earlier decision of the AFT in Sub Chittar Singh has never been challenged by the petitioner. It is well settled that the UOI cannot adopt a pick and choose policy, and leave one decision unchallenged, while challenging a later decision on the same issue. Moreover, we find that the AFT, in the impugned order, has placed reliance on the decision in Sub Chittar Singh which, as we note, remains unchallenged.

(iv) Even on merits, there is no substance in the present petition. The reasoning of the AFT is unexceptionable. Though para 8 of the SAI required persons to exercise the option regarding the manner in which they were to be extended the benefit of the revised pay scales within three months of the SAI, which was issued on 11 October 2008, it was extended twice. It was first extended by letter dated 21 December 2010 till 31 March 2011. Subsequently, by letter dated 11 December 2013, it was directed that applications for change of option received till 30 June 2011 would be processed. Though it is correct that the

respondents did not exercise their option within that period, it is also clear that each of the respondents had exercised their option prior to 30 December 2013. (v) Moreover, we are also in agreement with the AFT's reliance on clause 14(b)(iv) of the SAL, which mandated that, if no option was exercised by the individual, the PAO would regulate the fixation of pay of the individual on promotion to ensure that he would be extended the more beneficial of the two options, i.e., of either of re-fixation of pay with effect from 1 January 2006 or w.e.f. the date of his next promotion.

(vi) We are in agreement with the AFT that, given the fact that the instruction was pertaining to officers in the army, and was inherently beneficial in nature, it has to be accorded an expansive interpretation. The AFT has correctly noted that the very purpose of granting extension of time for exercise of option was to cater to situations in which the officers concerned who in many cases, such as the cases before us, were not of very high ranks, would not have been aware of the date from which they were required to exercise their option and therefore may have either exercised their option belatedly or failed to exercise their option. It was, obviously, to ensure that an equitable dispensation of the recommendations of the 6th CPC that clause 14(b)(iv) place the responsibility on the PAO(OR) to ensure that the officers were given the more beneficial of the options available to them.

(vii) There is no dispute about the fact that, by re-fixing the pay of the respondents w.e.f. 1 January 2006 instead of the date from which they were promoted to the next grade

between 1 January 2006 and 11 October 2008, the respondents suffered financial detriment. They, therefore, were not extended the most beneficial of the two options of pay of fixation available to them, as was required by clause 14(b)(iv) of the SAI. 25.

25. We, therefore, are in complete agreement with the impugned judgment of the AFT and see no cause to interfere therein."

4. We have examined numerous cases pertaining to the incorrect pay fixation in 6th 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 14 of the SAI 1/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.

5. Similarly, in the matter of incorrect pay fixation in the 7th 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 7th 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 7th 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 6th 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 7th 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."

6. 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 6th 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 7th 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."*

7. In the light of the above considerations, the OA 1227/2025 is allowed and the respondents are directed to:

(a) Review the pay fixed of the applicant under the 6th CPC w.e.f. 01.01.2006 after due verification in a manner that is most beneficial to the applicant

while ensuring that the applicant is not drawing less pay than his coursemate/junior.

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

(c) To pay the arrears within three months of this order.1

8. No order as to costs.


[JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA]
MEMBER(J)

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

/chanana/