

83 ✓  
COURT NO. 2  
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

12.

OA 3394/2025

MR 10342F- Major Himanshu Malik ..... Applicant  
Versus  
Union of India & Ors. .... Respondents

For Applicant : Mr Vishal Kumar Singh, proxy for Mr  
Kavish Agarwala, Advocate  
For Respondents : Capt Isha Mehrotra, OIC Legal Cell

CORAM

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

ORDER  
30.10.2025

The applicant MR 10342F- Major Himanshu Malik vide the present OA filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 makes the following prayers:

- (a) *“Refund of Financial loss: To direct the respondents to rectify basic pay fixation anomaly in salary of the applicant by re-*

*fixing his basic pay as per the most beneficial option to applicant on implementation of 7<sup>th</sup> CPC and subsequently direct the respondents to make payment of arrear of salary accrue to him on re-fixation of his basic pay, following most beneficial option.*

- (b) Interest" To direct the respondents to pay interest 18% p.a. on the arrears accrued to the applicant on arrears of payments on re-fixation of basic pay.*
- (c) Award Litigation Costs: Award the cost of litigation to the applicant, as the delay and inequity in his financial progression was not due to any fault of their own*
- (d) 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 Maj on 09.12.2023 in a manner that is more beneficial to the applicant.*
- (d) Any Other Relief: Pass any other order(s) of direction(s) that may be deemed just, proper and equitable in the facts and circumstances of the case, ensuring justice and parity for the Applicant."*

2. In reply to a specific Court query, the learned counsel for the applicant submits that the prayers made in the present OA are confined to the prayer 8(a) only and the prayers 8(b) and 8(c) to

the extent as prayed are not pressed. In view thereof, the prayers 8(b) and 8(c) as prayed are dismissed as withdrawn.

3. The applicant was commissioned in the Army Medical Corps(AMC) of the Indian Army on 02.06.2016 after having been found fit in all respects in the rank of Capt. The applicant submits that on the implementation of the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC, the respondents adopted arbitrary and discriminatory pay fixation policy resulting in officers commissioned via the AFMC route in March 2016 receiving significantly higher pay and allowances as compared to the officers like the applicant, who completed their MBBS and CRMI from civilian medical colleges and were commissioned into the Army Medical Corps(AMC) through the interview process. The applicant further submits that he was receiving the same basic pay and grade pay as officers who were commissioned on 17<sup>th</sup> March, 2015 through AFMC Pune, and after completing their CRMI, were promoted to the rank of Captain with their seniority dated 18<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 under the said institution up until May, 2017. However, after May, 2017, the respondents revised the pay

structure pursuant to the implementation of the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC and the Principal Controller of Accounts(PCDA) has reflected his basic pay as Rs.69,100/- in the official Statement of Account, however, he was placed on the basic pay of Rs.63,100/-at the time of commissioning as Captain thereby creating a discrepancy in pay fixation. The applicant further submits that his current basic pay is lower than that of officers junior to him, who were granted seniority as Captain from July, 2016 through AFMC, Pune and in this anomalous situation wherein a senior officer draws less pay than his junior holding the same substantive rank and performing identical duties and such a discrepancy not only violates the principles of natural justice and administrative fairness but also further highlights the systemic inconsistency in implementing the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC recommendations across similarly situated officers. The applicant submits he represented to PCDA(O), Pune in November, 2021 highlighting the anomaly and provided all documents, however the response received from the respondents on 07.03.2022 is to the effect:

*“Reply: The provision as mentioned by you is for switching over to 7<sup>th</sup> CPC and revision of pay accordingly. You have get commission in 7<sup>th</sup> CPC duration and hence your pay has been fixed at the minimum pay of the matrix. AS/SAO: KHAGESH KUMAR(LW).*

*Reply Date: 07 Mar 2022: 12:00:00”*

The applicant submits that no policy or administrative guideline justifies a differential treatment among officers of the same recruitment year and stream, especially when the only distinction is the month of commissioning and thus the respondents failed to apply the most beneficial option, as permitted under the 7<sup>th</sup> CPC and denied him the parity and fair progression. The applicant further has further relied upon a catena of orders passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal including the order in the case of *Sub M L Shrivastava & Ors Vs Union of India & Ors in OA 1182/2028 dated 30.09.2021.*

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. In the light of the above considerations, the OA 3394/2025 is allowed and we direct the respondents to:

(a) Review the pay fixation of the applicant in the rank of Capt 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 by ensuring that the applicant is not getting less as compared to his junior or bath-mates.

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

10. No order as to costs.

(JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA)  
MEMBER(J)

(REAR ADMIRAL DHIREN VIG)  
MEMBER (A)

/Chanana/