

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

6.

OA 3095/2025

IC-74077X Col Sandhya Yadav ..... Applicant  
Versus  
Union of India & Ors. .... Respondents

For Applicant : Mr Prashant Negi & Ms Shruti  
Rawat, Advocates

For Respondents : Major Satvik Grover, OIC Legal.

CORAM

HON'BLE JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA, MEMBER(J)  
HON'BLE LT REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG, MEMBER (A)

ORDER  
09.10.2025

The applicant IC-74077X Col Sandhya Yadav 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 7<sup>th</sup> CPC in the Rank of Col and thereafter despite directions, the respondents have not rectified the fixation of the pay of the applicant in the Rank of Col which*

*was more beneficial to her at the time of 7<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 7<sup>th</sup> CPC on promotion to the rank of Col(TS) on 11.03.2022 in a manner that is more beneficial to the applicant.*
- (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 11.03.1995 after having been found fit in all respects and was promoted to the rank of Col(TS) on 11.03.2022 and the same was published vide Part II Order dated 24.03.2022. The applicant submits that her pay was fixed in the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC in the revised pay structure of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC, merely on the ground of non-exercising of option for the date of switch over to the revised pay structure within the stipulated period of time whereas the pay of her course-mates got fixed at a higher level on being promoted to the

rank of Col as they had exercised the most beneficial option. The application further submits that she approached the respondents on multiple occasions for correct/beneficial fixation of pay in the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC including her grievances dated 10.08.2022, however the respondents have denied the same for the lack of option on time vide their reply dated 18.08.2022 stating to the effect:

*"DGN has not been received till date after receipt of the same action will be taken accordingly.  
Regards AO/SAO G SHALINI SRINIVAS(LW)  
Reply Date: 18-Aug-2022 12:00:00"*

3. The applicant submits that the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC were finally accepted and implemented by the respondents to be effective wef 01.01.2016 in terms of Army Pay Rules in the case of officers who were on the effective strength of the Army as on 01.01.2016. The said Statutory Rules & Orders (SRO) also had a provision for exercise of option for fixation of pay for those who were promoted from one Rank to the other between 01.01.2016 to the date of issuance of instructions i.e. till 03.05.2017 to continue in the pre-revised pay



scale of 6<sup>th</sup> CPC and get the pay fixed from the date of promotion or from Date of Next Increment (DNI) which is more beneficial and the time limit for such option was prescribed to be 180 days from the date of issuance of the said instructions. The applicant further submits that vide MoD D(Pay)/Services)OM No.1(20)/2017/D(Pay/Services) dated 26.02.2019 of the respondents it was stipulated that "Option has to be exercised within three months from the date of promotion, to get their pay fixed under these provisions from the date of such promotion or to have the pay fixed from the date of accrual of next increment in the pay scale of the pay in the lower grade. The applicant submits that because of the wrong fixation of pay, her pay was fixed much lower than his juniors on account of the fact that the applicant had not exercised the option of how her pay was to be fixed on promotion during the transition period of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC within the stipulated time and many officers including the applicant were denied the benefits of fixation of the pay in the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC from the date of promotion to the rank of Col on 11.03.2022 which was more beneficial instead of w.e.f. 01.01.2016 from the



date of implementation of the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC and thus her pay was fixed much lesser on promotion to the rank of Col as compared to his batch-mates/juniors and such pay disparity continued due to initial wrong fixation of pay during the transition period of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC in the rank Col. The applicant submits that the direction was passed by ADGPS(PS-3) Dte Letter No. B/25451/Doc Pro Offrs/AG/PS-3(D)/02/2021 dated 21.06.2021 vide which it was communicated to PCDA(O) that exercising of Option is mandatory and those officers who have been promoted or granted financial up-gradation as on or after 01.01.2016 and desire to exercise/re-exercise option for pay fixation from DNI may opt within three months from the date of issue of GoI, MoD, New Delhi OM dated 25.06.2024 i.e.by 17.11.2023. The applicant further submits that despite the repeated requests, 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.

4. 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.

5. 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 Mahendra Lal

*Shrivastava(Retd)* with observations in Para-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 SAI, 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. We, therefore, are in complete agreement with the impugned judgment of the AFT and see no cause to interfere therein."

6. 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."

7. 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."*

8. In view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal 1943/2022 in *Lt Col Suprita Chandel vs. UOI & Ors.* whereby vide Paras-14 and 15 thereof, it has been observed to the effect:-

*"14. It is a well settled principle of law that where a citizen aggrieved by an action of the government department has approached the*

court and obtained a declaration of law in his/her favour, others similarly situated ought to be extended the benefit without the need for them to go to court. [See *Amrit Lal Berry vs. Collector of Central Excise, New Delhi and Others*, (1975) 4 SCC 714]

15. In *K.I. Shephard and Others vs. Union of India and Others*, (1987) 4 SCC 431, this Court while reinforcing the above principle held as under:-

*“19. The writ petitions and the appeals must succeed. We set aside the impugned judgments of the Single Judge and Division Bench of the Kerala High Court and direct that each of the three transferee banks should take over the excluded employees on the same terms and conditions of employment under the respective banking companies prior to amalgamation. The employees would be entitled to the benefit of continuity of service for all purposes including salary and perks throughout the period. We leave it open to the transferee banks to take such action as they consider proper against these employees in accordance with law. Some of the excluded employees have not come to court. There is no justification to penalise them for not having litigated. They too shall be entitled to the same benefits as the petitioners. ....”*

*(Emphasis Supplied)”*,

all persons aggrieved similarly situated may not litigate on the same issue and would be entitled to the grant of the benefits of which have already been extended to others similarly situated .

9. Vide orders of this Tribunal in *Sub M.L Shrivastava and others Vs Union of India and others* (O.A No. 1182 of 2018 decided on 03.09.2021) which has been upheld by Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide judgment dated 05.05.2025 in WP (C) 5880/2025 in *Union of India and others* versus *Sub Mahendra Lal Shrivastava Retd* vide observations in Paras 24 and 25 thereof which read 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 SAI, 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. We, therefore, are in complete agreement with the impugned judgment of the AFT and see no cause to interfere therein.,*

it is apparent that the mere non exercise of the beneficial option by the applicant or non exercise thereof within the stipulated period of time cannot be a ground to dis-entitle the applicant of the most beneficial option for implementation of the 7th CPC recommendations and the fixation of the pay and the pension of the applicant, merely because the promotion of the applicant had not taken place in the period of transition from the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC to the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC.

10. In the light of the above considerations, the OA 3095/2025 is allowed and we direct the respondents to:

(a) Review the pay fixation of the applicant on her promotion to the rank of Col(TS) on 11.03.2022 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.

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

11. No order as to costs.

(JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA)  
MEMBER(J)

(REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG)  
MEMBER (A)

/Chanana/