

158 we

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

OA No. 2055 of 2019

Ex Rect Dhan Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

.... Respondents

For Applicant:

Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta, Advocate

For Respondents:

Mr. K.K. Tyagi, Advocate

CORAM:

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

O R D E R

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 are read as under:

“(a) Quash Garhwal Rifles Regimental Centre, Lansdowne’s discharge certificate Ser No 87 of case file No 4703/Pension/Depot dated 02.11.2019 attached as Annexure A-1 to the OA and marked as Impugned letter.

(b) Allow the applicant to rejoin the training with immediate effect from the stage he was withdrawn.

(c) Grant the applicant the original seniority of the course from which he was withdrawn from training.

(d) Pay the applicant the arrears of his pay and allowances from the date he was withdrawn from training till the date of actual payment along with interest @ 18% per annum.

(e) Compensate the applicant for the trauma, harassment and the mental agony caused to the applicant and to his family members due to three unsuccessful operations.

(f) Award cost of petition.

(g) Pass such and further order or orders, as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in favor of the petitioner and against the respondents.

BRIEF FACTS

2. The applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 22.06.2017 and was discharged from service under item IV annexed to Rule 13 (3) of the Army Rules, 1954 due to the disability **'PERFORATION PEITONITIS (OPTD) WITH ENTEROCUTANEOUS FISTULA (OPTD)'** on 30.10.2019 (A/N).

3. The applicant was undergoing Basic Military Training and due to the disability **'PERFORATION PEITONITIS (OPTD) WITH ENTEROCUTANEOUS FISTULA (OPTD)'** he was hospitalized which resulted in continuous absence of 479 days from the military training.

4. During the treatment, the applicant was downgraded to LMC P-2, (T-24) for 03 months i.e., from 16.11.2018 to 09.02.2019 and continued to undergo the treatment. The applicant was again downgraded to medical category P-2, T-24 for 06 months, i.e., from 28.02.2019 to 27.08.2019. The applicant, however, prior to the discharge was upgraded to medical category SHAPE-1.

5. The applicant was served with a Show-Cause Notice (SCN) dated 14.09.2019 (Annexure A-5) prior to his discharge. The applicant vide letter dated 17.09.2019 replied to the SCN stating his medical treatment history as a reason for his continuous absence from the basic military training. The applicant was thereafter discharged from the service w.e.f. 30.10.2019 (A/N) under Rule 13 (3) IV of Army Rules, 1954 and in terms of Para 13 of SOP on Regulations of Recruits issued vide Directorate General of Infantry/Infantry-2, General Staff Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army) letter No, 20032/Trg/Inf-2 dated 28.03.2018.

6. 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

7. The applicant, through this OA, sought for the grant of *inter alia* to rejoin the training and restoration of original seniority. However, during the course of hearing on 20.05.2025, the learned counsel for the applicant sought to confine the prayer made in the OA for seeking the grant of Invalid Pension only. Thus, the present case is being considered qua the prayer for the grant of Invalid Pension only.

8. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 22.06.2017 after a thorough medical check-up in fit medical condition and was discharged from service w.e.f. 31.10.2019 due to his ailment and deteriorated medical condition which he developed during the training and subsequent to three unsuccessful and negligent surgical attempts which downgraded the overall health of the applicant.

9. 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 disease '**PERFORATION PEITONITIS (OPTD) WITH ENTEROCUTANEOUS FISTULA (OPTD)**' during the service training.

10. The learned counsel for the applicant 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) SCW 4236], 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.

11. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the applicant was enrolled in the Indian Army on 22.06.2017 and was discharged from service w.e.f. 30.10.2019 (A/N), on the ground of missing training for more than 180 days on medical grounds, in terms of Para 13 of SOP on Regulations of Recruits issued vide Directorate General of Infantry/Infantry-2, General Staff Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army) letter No, 20032/Trg/Inf-2 dated 28.03.2018.

12. The learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that prior to discharge of the applicant, the approval of the Commandant, Garhwal Rifles Regimental Centre, had been accorded to ensure proper compliance of the rules and policies for discharge.

13. The learned counsel for the respondents further submitted that the applicant was rendered the best possible medical aid for his disease for a long duration of 479 days during which he underwent multiple surgeries which helped him to recover the illness and become SHAPE-1 medical category prior to discharge.

14. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the reliance placed by the counsel for the applicant on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Dharamvir Singh** (Supra) is misplaced as the applicant prior to discharge had become SHAPE – 1 in medical category and there was no disease / infirmity which could be taken as attributable to aggravated by the military service.

15. The learned counsel for the respondents, in Para 5J of the counter affidavit, submitted that the discharge of the applicant had been issued under item IV annexed to Rule 13

(3) of the Army Rules, 1954 and not under item III (iv) annexed to Rule 13 (3) of Army Rules. It was further submitted that Rules 13 (3) IV pertains to all classes of discharge of such persons who were enrolled under the Act but not attested.

ANALYSIS

16. On the careful perusal of the material available on record and also the submissions made on behalf of the parties, we are of the view that it is not in dispute that the applicant was discharged from service on the ground of missing training for more than 180 days on medical grounds, in terms of Para 13 of SOP on Regulations of Recruits issued vide Directorate General of Infantry/Infantry-2, General Staff Branch, IHQ of MoD (Army) letter No, 20032/Trg/Inf-2 dated 28.03.2018. The medical category of the applicant prior to discharge was also upgraded to SHAPE-1 and he was discharged under Rule 13 (3) IV of Army Rules 1954.

17. The respondents in compliance of the order dated 09.07.2025 have produced the original file pertaining to the discharge of the applicant and upon perusal it was observed that the applicant was discharged in terms of Para 13 of the SOP on Relegation of Recruits promulgated vide Directorate

General of Infantry/Infantry-2, General Staff Branch, IHQ-MoD (Army) letter No. 20032/Trg/Inf-2 dated 28 March 2013, and the applicant was discharged under provisions of Rule 13 (3) item IV of Army Rules 1954. Para 13 of the said SOP is reproduced herein as under: -

“13. Invalidment. In case a recruit was missing training for more than 180 days on medical grounds he will be discharged under the provisions of Army Rule 13 (3) item IV. Procedure of giving adequate time to the effected recruit, through a written show cause notice, as to why he should not be discharged will be followed. If an indl is unlikely to be fit for mil trg within six months of his first absence from trg due to illness, it will be ensured such indls are not being discharged from MH on low med but will be invalided out of service.”

Para 13 of the said SOP encapsulates that those individuals who have missed training for more than 180 days on medical grounds will be discharged under item IV of Rule 13(3) of Army Rules 1954 and will be treated as invalided out from service.

18. Upon perusal of the record it is observed that the applicant initially joined Course Serial Number 76 and his basic training started w.e.f. 15.07.2017. During the basic military training the applicant got injured on 25.07.2017

during physical training parade and was excused from attending parades. The applicant was sent on sick leave for a period of 28 days and had undergone treatment for his medical category A3 (T-06). The applicant was again upgraded to medical category SHAPE-1 on 17.11.2017 after a series of treatment and surgeries and he was relegated to Course Serial Number 78 w.e.f. 18.11.2017, as he had missed training for 99 days, however, the applicant during his training with Course Serial Number 78 was again admitted to MH Lansdowne on 18.05.2018 as he was diagnosed with **‘PERFORATION PEITONITIS (OPTD) WITH ENTEROCUTANEOUS FISTULA (OPTD)’**. The applicant again underwent treatment for his disease and he remained absent from military training for 479 days in total.

19. The competent authority in view of the medical history of the applicant issued Show Cause Notice (SCN) to the applicant dated 14.09.2019 and the applicant vide letter dated 21.12.2019 replied to the SCN and the competent authority in view of Para 13 of the SOP (supra) as brought out in Para 17 above, proceeded with the discharge of the applicant.

20. The applicant after being relegated to Course Serial Number 78 remained absent from training for 479 days and in terms of Para 13 of the SOP (supra), the applicant is deemed to be invalided out from service on medical grounds after having served around 02 years 04 months and 08 days and is eligible for Invalid Pension.

21. Lest it be contended that the applicant being invalided out after serving around 02 years 04 months and 08 days, however may not be eligible for getting the invalid pension as per Rule 59 of the Pension Regulation for the Army, 2008 (Part-1), which reads as under:

“ 59. The minimum period of qualifying service actually rendered and required for invalid pension is 10 years or more. For less than 10 years’ 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.

.....”

22. 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.”

23. 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.”**

24. 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."

25. 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.”

The respondents have filed SLP (Civil) bearing diary no. 38701/2025 in the Hon’ble Supreme Court assailing the order dated 07.07.2023 in OA 2240/2019, however, 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)***.

CONCLUSION

26. 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 disability **'PERFORATION PEITONITIS (OPTD) WITH ENTEROCUTANEOUS FISTULA (OPTD)'** as the applicant rendered 02 years and 04 months and 08 days of military service and was invalided out from the Indian Army solely 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.

27. 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 shall be restricted to commence to run from a period of 03 (three) years prior to the date of filing of the present OA i.e., 20.11.2019, and shall be paid by the respondents failing which the applicant will be entitled for

interest at @ 6% p.a. from the date of receipt of copy of the order by the respondents.

28. Consequently, Miscellaneous Application(s) if any, stands disposed off accordingly.

Pronounced in the open Court on this 30th day of September, 2025.

[JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON]
CHAIRPERSON

[REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG]
MEMBER (A)

/PRGx/