

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

116.

OA 2130/2024

RADM Ajay Vinay Bhave VSM (Retd) Applicant
Versus
Union of India & Ors. Respondents

For Applicant : Mr. Shakti Chand Jaidwal, Advocate
For Respondents : Mr. R S Chhillar, Advocate

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

ORDER
07.02.2025

OA 2130/2024

Invoking the jurisdiction of this Tribunal under Section 14, the applicant has filed this application and the reliefs claimed in Para 8 read as under:

“(a) Set aside the impugned order dated 15.05.2024 passed by the respondents rejecting second and final appeal of the applicant for grant of disability pension by considering his disabilities as NANA.

(b) Direct the respondents to treat both disabilities of the applicant, namely, “(i) PRIMARY HYPERTENSION and (ii) DYSLIPIDEMIA” as attributable to/aggravated by stress and strain of Naval Service.

(c) Direct the respondents to grant disability pension to the applicant @ 33.5% for life wef 01.03.2024, as degree of his disablement has been assessed composite @ 33.5% for life by the RMB.

(d) Direct the respondents to pay disability pension to the applicant at enhanced rate of 50% for life w.e.f

01.03.2024 by broad banding his disabilities to 50% as per Govt. Policy dated 31.01.2001;

(e) Direct the respondents to pay to the applicant an interest @ 10% p.a. on arrears of the disability pension w.e.f. 01.03.2024 and/or;

(f) Issue such other order(s)/direction(s) as may be deemed appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant was commissioned in the Indian Navy on 01.07.1986 and discharged from service on 29.02.2024 after about 37 years of qualifying service. The Release Medical Board held that the applicant was fit to be discharged from service in composite low medical category S2A2 (P) for the disabilities- (a) Primary Hypertension ICD No I10 @ 30% for life and (b) Dyslipidemia ICD No E 78.0 @ 5%, with composite disability @ 33.5% for life while the qualifying element for disability pension was recorded as NIL for life on account of disabilities being treated as neither attributable to nor aggravated by military service (NANA).

3. The claim for disability element of pension was rejected by the adjudicating authority vide their letter dated 06.07.2023. Against the said rejection, the applicant preferred a 1st Appeal dated 31.07.2023 and the same was rejected by the respondents vide their letter dated 13.10.2023. Thereafter, the applicant preferred

the 2nd Appeal dated 30.10.2023 and the same was also rejected by the respondents vide impugned order dated 15.05.2024 (Annexure A-1). Aggrieved by the same, the applicant has approached this Tribunal. In the interest of justice thus, it is considered appropriate to take up the present OA for consideration, in terms of Section 21(1) of the AFT, Act 2007.

4. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the prayers made in the present OA are confined to the grant of disability element of pension in relation to the disability of Primary Hypertension @ 30% for life only and the prayer made for grant of disability element of pension in relation to disability ID "Dyslipidemia" is not pressed.

5. The consistent view taken by this Tribunal qua the disability of primary hypertension is based on the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Dharamvir Singh Vs. Union of India & Others (Civil Appeal No.4949/2013); (2013) 7 SCC 316, the Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982, and observations in Para 28 of the said verdict to the effect:-

"28. A conjoint reading of various provisions, reproduced above, makes it clear that:

(i) *Disability pension to be granted to an individual who is invalidated from service on account of a disability which is attributable to or aggravated by military service in non-battle casualty and is assessed at 20% or over. The question whether a disability is attributable or aggravated by military service to be determined under "Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, 1982" of Appendix-II (Regulation 173).*

(ii) *A member is to be presumed in sound physical and mental condition upon entering service if there is no note or record at the time of entrance. In the event of his subsequently being discharged from service on medical grounds any deterioration in his health is to be presumed due to service. [Rule 5 r/w Rule 14(b)].*

(iii) *Onus of proof is not on the claimant (employee), the corollary is that onus of proof that the condition for non-entitlement is with the employer. A claimant has a right to derive benefit of any reasonable doubt and is entitled for pensionary benefit more liberally. (Rule 9).*

(iv) *If a disease is accepted to have been as having arisen in service, it must also be established that the conditions of military service determined or contributed to the onset of the disease and that the conditions were due to the circumstances of duty in military service. [Rule 14(c)].*

(v) *If no note of any disability or disease was made at the time of individual's acceptance for military service, a disease which has led to an individual's discharge or death will be deemed to have arisen in service. [14(b)].*

(vi) *If medical opinion holds that the disease could not have been detected on medical examination prior to the acceptance for service and that disease will not be deemed to have arisen during service, the Medical Board is required to state the reasons. [14(b)]; and*

(vii) *It is mandatory for the Medical Board to follow the guidelines laid down in Chapter-II of the "Guide to Medical (Military Pension), 2002 - "Entitlement : General Principles", including paragraph 7,8 and 9 as referred to above."*

Further as per amendment to Chapter VI of the 'Guide to Medical Officers (Military Pensions) 2008, at Para 43, it is provided as under:-

"43. Hypertension – The first consideration should be to determine whether the hypertension is primary or secondary. If (e.g. Nephritis), and it is unnecessary to notify hypertension separately.

As in the case of atherosclerosis, entitlement of attributability is never appropriate, but where disablement for essential hypertension appears to have arisen or become worse in service, the question whether service compulsions have caused aggravation must be considered. However, in certain cases the disease has been reported after long and frequent spells of service in field/HAA/active operational area. Such cases can be explained

by variable response exhibited by different individuals to stressful situations. Primary hypertension will be considered aggravated if it occurs while serving in Field areas, HAA, CIOPS areas or prolonged afloat service."

6. It has, already been observed by this Tribunal in a catena of cases that peace stations have their own pressure of rigorous military training and associated stress and strain of the service. It may also be taken into consideration that most of the personnel of the armed forces have to work in the stressful and hostile environment, difficult weather conditions and under strict disciplinary norms.

7. The 'Entitlement Rules for Casualty Pensionary Awards, to the Armed Forces Personnel 2008, which take effect from 01.01.2008 provide vide Paras 6,7,10,11 thereof as under:-

"6. Causal connection:

For award of disability pension/special family pension, a causal connection between disability or death and military service has to be established by appropriate authorities.

7. Onus of proof:

Ordinarily the claimant will not be called upon to prove the condition of entitlement. However, where the claim is preferred after 15 years of discharge/retirement/invalidment/ release by which time the service documents of the claimant are destroyed after the prescribed retention period, the onus to prove the entitlement would lie on the claimant.

10. Attributability:

(a) Injuries:

In respect of accidents or injuries, the following rules shall be observed:

(i) Injuries sustained when the individual is 'on duty', as defined, shall be treated as attributable to military service, (provided a nexus between injury and military service is established).

(ii) In cases of self-inflicted injuries while 'on duty', attributability shall not be conceded unless it is established that service factors were responsible for such action.

(b) Disease:

(i) For acceptance of a disease as attributable to military service, the following two conditions must be satisfied simultaneously:-

(a) that the disease has arisen during the period of military service, and

(b) that the disease has been caused by the conditions of employment in military service.

(ii) Disease due to infection arising in service other than that transmitted through sexual contact shall merit an entitlement of attributability and where the disease may have been contracted prior to enrolment or during leave, the incubation period of the disease will be taken into consideration on the basis of clinical courses as determined by the competent medical authority.

(iii) If nothing at all is known about the cause of disease and the presumption of the entitlement in favour of the claimant is not rebutted, attributability

should be conceded on the basis of the clinical picture and current scientific medical application.

(iv) when the diagnosis and/or treatment of a disease was faulty, unsatisfactory or delayed due to exigencies of service, disability caused due to any adverse effects arising as a complication shall be conceded as attributable.

11. *Aggravation:*

A disability shall be conceded aggravated by service if its onset is hastened or the subsequent course is worsened by specific conditions of military service, such as posted in places of extreme climatic conditions, environmental factors related to service conditions e.g. Fields, Operations, High Altitude etc.”

Thus, the ratio of the verdicts in *Dharamvir Singh* Vs. *Union Of India &Ors* (Civil Appeal No.4949/2013); (2013 7 SCC 316), *Sukhvinder Singh* Vs. *Union Of India &Ors*, dated 25.06.2014 reported in 2014 STPL (Web) 468 SC, *Union of India & Ors.* Vs. *Rajbir Singh* [(2015) 12 SCC 264] and *Union of India & Ors.* Vs. *Manjeet Singh* dated 12.05.2015, Civil Appeal No.4357-4358 of 2015, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court are the fulcrum of these rules as well.

Furthermore, Regulation 423 of the Regulations for the Medical Services of the Armed Forces 2010 which relates to 'Attributability to Service' provides as under:-

“423. (a). For the purpose of determining whether the cause of a disability or death resulting from disease is or not attributable to Service. It is immaterial whether the cause giving rise to the disability or death occurred in an area declared to be a Field Area/Active Service area or under normal peace conditions. It is however, essential to establish whether the disability or death bore a causal connection with the service conditions. All evidences both direct and

circumstantial will be taken into account and benefit of reasonable doubt, if any, will be given to the individual. The evidence to be accepted as reasonable doubt for the purpose of these instructions should be of a degree of cogency, which though not reaching certainty, nevertheless carries a high degree of probability. In this connection, it will be remembered that proof beyond reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond a shadow of doubt. If the evidence is so strong against an individual as to leave only a remote possibility in his/her favor, which can be dismissed with the sentence "of course it is possible but not in the least probable" the case is proved beyond reasonable doubt. If on the other hand, the evidence be so evenly balanced as to render impracticable a determinate conclusion one way or the other, then the case would be one in which the benefit of the doubt could be given more liberally to the individual, in case occurring in Field Service/Active Service areas.

(b). Decision regarding attributability of a disability or death resulting from wound or injury will be taken by the authority next to the Commanding officer which in no case shall be lower than a Brigadier/Sub Area Commander or equivalent. In case of injuries which were self-inflicted or due to an individual's own serious negligence or misconduct, the Board will also comment how far the disablement resulted from self-infliction, negligence or misconduct.

(c). The cause of a disability or death resulting from a disease will be regarded as attributable to Service when it is established that the disease arose during Service and the conditions and circumstances of duty in the Armed Forces determined and contributed to the onset of the disease. Cases, in which it is established that Service conditions did not determine or contribute to the onset of the disease but influenced the subsequent course of the disease, will be regarded as aggravated by the service. A disease which has led to an individual's discharge or death will ordinarily be deemed to have arisen in Service if no note of it was made at the time of the individual's acceptance for Service in the Armed Forces. However, if medical opinion holds, for reasons to be stated that the disease could not have been detected on medical examination prior to acceptance for service, the disease will not be deemed to have arisen during service.

(d). The question, whether a disability or death resulting from disease is attributable to or aggravated by service or not, will be decided as regards its medical aspects by a Medical Board or by the medical officer who signs the Death Certificate. The Medical Board/Medical Officer will specify reasons for their/his opinion. The opinion of the Medical Board/Medical Officer, in so far as it relates to the actual causes of the disability or death and the circumstances in which it originated will be regarded as final. The question whether the cause and the attendant circumstances can be accepted as attributable to/aggravated by service for the

purpose of pensionary benefits will, however, be decided by the pension sanctioning authority.

(e). To assist the medical officer who signs the Death certificate or the Medical Board in the case of an invalid, the CO unit will furnish a report on :

(i) AFMSF – 16 (Version – 2002) in all cases

(ii) IAFY – 2006 in all cases of injuries.

(f). In cases where award of disability pension or reassessment of disabilities is concerned, a Medical Board is always necessary and the certificate of a single medical officer will not be accepted except in case of stations where it is not possible or feasible to assemble a regular Medical Board for such purposes. The certificate of a single medical officer in the latter case will be furnished on a Medical Board form and countersigned by the Col (Med) Div/MG (Med) Area/Corps/Comd (Army) and equivalent in Navy and Air Force.”

(emphasis supplied),—

has not been obliterated.

8. The applicant has served in the Indian Navy for about 37 years and the onset of the disability of “Primary Hypertension” occurred in July, 2018 after 32 years of long service. The applicant has done 11 afloat appointments (field posting) in his career. The accumulated stress and strain of such a long service on the applicant cannot be overlooked and, therefore, the disability of the applicant has to be conceded to be attributable to and aggravated by Naval service.

9. In view of the aforesaid judicial pronouncements and the parameters referred to above, the applicant is entitled for disability element of pension in respect of disability

Primary Hypertension. Accordingly, we allow this application holding that the applicant is entitled to disability element of pension @ 30% rounded off to 50% for life with effect from the date of his discharge in terms of the judicial pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Union of India Vs. Ram Avtar (Civil Appeal No.418/2012), decided on 10.12.2014.

10. 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, 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.

11. No order as to costs.

[JUSTICE RAJENDRA MENON]
CHAIRPERSON

[REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG]
MEMBER (A)

Neha