

COURT No.2  
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

6.

OA 253/2026

Ex DFR Amit Kumar ..... Applicant  
VERSUS  
Union of India and Ors. .... Respondents

For Applicant : Mr. Sukhbir Singh, Advocate  
For Respondents : None  
Maj Abhishek Kumar, OIC, Legal Cell

CORAM

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

ORDER  
28.01.2026

A submission is made on behalf of the applicant that there is a typographical error in prayer 8(b) wherein it has been stated to the effect:-

*“(b) Direct the respondents to grant 3rd MACP of the rank of Naiib Subedar to the applicant and to fix service pension from the date of discharge ie 01.06.2025 accordingly.”*

which is sought to be rectified to read as:-

*“(b) Direct the respondents to grant 3rd MACP of the rank of Naiib Risaldar to the applicant and to fix service pension from the date of discharge ie 01.06.2025 accordingly.”*

which prayer is allowed and the amendment so incorporated into the prayer clause in view of the vakalatnama placed on record of the learned counsel present on behalf of the applicant.

2. The prayers in the present OA thus read to the effect:-

*(a) quash and set aside impugned letter No 15502687H/MACP/SP-3/NE&PG dated 18.12.2025. And/or*

*(b) Direct the respondents to grant 3rd MACP of the rank of Naib Risaldar to the applicant and to fix service pension from the date of discharge ie 01.06.2025 accordingly. And/or*

*(c) Direct respondents to pay the due arrears of pension and retiral benefits along with the arrears and @12% interest thereupon.*

*(d) Any other relief(s) which this Hon'ble may deem appropriate, just and proper in the interest of justice and in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be granted to the applicant."*

3. Notice of the OA was issued to the respondents vide proceedings dated 27.01.2026.

4. In view of the impugned order on the record dated 18.12.2025, it was considered essential that the respondents ascertain the factum of the said order No. 15502687/MACP/SP-3/NE&PG dated 18.12.2025 as being the impugned order in question.

5. On behalf of the respondents, Maj Abhishek Kumar, OIC, Legal Cell affirms the factum of the said impugned order No. 15502687/MACP/SP-3/NE&PG dated 18.12.2025 being the impugned order in question.

6. Consequentially, it is apparent through the impugned order that the only reason for the denial of the grant of the MACP benefit to the applicant was that he had proceeded on premature retirement on 31.05.2025 and though he had completed a period of eight years in

his previous rank of *Najib Risaldar*, he was not granted the benefit of the MACP scheme in as much as the respondents seek to contend vide the impugned order dated 18.12.2025 that he was due for the next MACP with effect from 01.06.2025 as per his promotion date and not as per the date of his enrolment or date of birth.

7. On behalf of the applicant, reliance has been placed on the order dated 19.08.2015 of the Larger Bench of the Armed Forces Tribunal (RB) Chandigarh at Chandimandir in OA 1641 of 2013 in *Banarasi Dass vs Union of India and others* and it is essential to advert to the question of law that was considered therein which reads to the effect:-

*"Whether a Havildar who after the commencement of 6th Central Pay Commission retires just after completion of his tenure of 24 years on the last date of a month is entitled to get MACP (Modified Assured Career Progression)?"*,-

which vide paragraph 27 of the said order has been answered to the effect:-

*"27. Having regard what has been said above, we are of the view that a Havildar who retires just after completion of his tenure of 24 years on the last date of month is also entitled to get MACP. The question posed in para 2 of the judgment is, thus, answered in affirmative by holding that on completion of 24 years of service the 3<sup>rd</sup> ACP would be payable automatically."*

8. It is essential to observe that Civil Appeal filed vide diary No 18345/2017 by the Union of India and others against the said order in *Banarasi Dass* (supra) was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 17.09.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

9. In view thereof, the order dated 19.05.2015 in OA 1641 of 2013 of the AFT (RB) Chandigarh at Chandimandir has attained finality and the matter in issue is no longer *res integra*.

10. It is further essential to advert to order dated 30.11.2023 of the AFT (PB) New Delhi in OA 1029 of 2017 in the case of *Ex Sgt K C Dutta vs UOI & Ors* whereby it has been observed vide paragraphs 10 to 13 thereof to the effect:-

“10. Furthermore, in the case of *P. Ayyamperumal Vs. The Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal and others* [W.P. No. 15732 of 2017] decided by the Hon’ble High Court of Judicature at Madras vide its verdict dated 15.09.2017, the petitioner, on superannuation, retired on 30.06.2013 and he was denied the last increment. As per the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC, the date of annual increment was fixed by the Central Govt. as 1<sup>st</sup> July of the year for all the employees and, therefore, since the petitioner was no longer in service on 01.07.2013, he could not be granted the same. The petitioner approached the Central Administrative Tribunal but his matter was dismissed, which was challenged by the petitioner in the Madras High Court by way of a writ petition i.e. W.P. No. 15732 of 2017. The Hon’ble Madras High Court allowed the writ petition and held that the employee had completed one full year of service, which entitles him to the benefit of increment which accrued to him during that period. Against this judgment of the Madras High Court, a Special Leave Petition (Dy. No.22282/2018) was filed before the Hon’ble Supreme Court, however, the same was dismissed vide order dated 23.07.2018.

11. It is essential to observe that vide judgment dated 11.04.2023 in Civil Appeal No. 2471 of 2023 in the case of *The Director (Admn. and HR) KPTCL & Ors. Vs. C.P. Mundinamani & Ors.*, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has upheld the view taken by the Hon’ble High Court of Madras in *P. Ayyamperumal (supra)*, which view has thus attained finality. Paras 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 and 7 of the said verdict of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 2471 of 2023 read as under :

“6.4 Now so far as the submission on behalf of the appellants that the annual increment is in the form of incentive and to encourage an employee to perform well and therefore, once he is not in service, there is no question of grant of annual increment is concerned, the aforesaid has no

*substance. In a given case, it may happen that the employee earns the increment three days before his date of superannuation and therefore, even according to the Regulation 40(1) increment is accrued on the next day in that case also such an employee would not have one year service thereafter. It is to be noted that increment is earned on one year past service rendered in a time scale. Therefore, the aforesaid submission is not to be accepted.*

*6.5 Now, so far as the submission on behalf of the appellants that as the increment has accrued on the next day on which it is earned and therefore, even in a case where an employee has earned the increment one day prior to his retirement but he is not in service the day on which the increment is accrued is concerned, while considering the aforesaid issue, the object and purpose of grant of annual increment is required to be considered. A government servant is granted the annual increment on the basis of his good conduct while rendering one year service. Increments are given annually to officers with good conduct unless such increments are withheld as a measure of punishment or linked with efficiency. Therefore, the increment is earned for rendering service with good conduct in a year/specified period. Therefore, the moment a government servant has rendered service for a specified period with good conduct, in a time scale, he is entitled to the annual increment and it can be said that he has earned the annual increment for rendering the specified period of service with good conduct. Therefore, as such, he is entitled to the benefit of the annual increment on the eventuality of having served for a specified period (one year) with good conduct efficiently. Merely because, the government servant has retired on the very next day, how can he be denied the annual increment which he has earned and/or is entitled to for rendering the service with good conduct and efficiently in the preceding one year. In the case of Gopal Singh (supra) in paragraphs 20, 23 and 24, the Delhi High Court has observed and held as under:-*

*(para 20)*

*“Payment of salary and increment to a central government servant is regulated by the provisions of F.R., CSR and Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules. Pay defined in F.R. 9(21) means the amount drawn monthly by a central government servant and includes the increment. A plain composite reading of applicable provisions leaves no ambiguity that annual increment is given to a government servant to enable him to discharge duties of the post and that pay and allowances are also attached to the post. Article 43 of the CSR defines progressive appointment to mean an*

*appointment wherein the pay is progressive, subject to good behaviour of an officer. It connotes that pay rises, by periodical increments from a minimum to a maximum. The increment in case of progressive appointment is specified in Article 151 of the CSR to mean that increment accrues from the date following that on which it is earned. The scheme, taken cumulatively, clearly suggests that appointment of a central government servant is a progressive appointment and periodical increment in pay from a minimum to maximum is part of the pay structure. Article 151 of CSR contemplates that increment accrues from the day following which it is earned. This increment is not a matter of course but is dependent upon good conduct of the central government servant. It is, therefore, apparent that central government employee earns increment on the basis of his good conduct for specified period i.e. a year in case of annual increment. Increment in pay is thus an integral part of progressive appointment and accrues from the day following which it is earned."*

*(para 23)*

*"Annual increment though is attached to the post & becomes payable on a day following which it is earned but the day on which increment accrues or becomes payable is not conclusive or determinative. In the statutory scheme governing progressive appointment increment becomes due for the services rendered over a year by the government servant subject to his good behaviour. The pay of a central government servant rises, by periodical increments, from a minimum to the maximum in the prescribed scale. The entitlement to receive increment therefore crystallises when the government servant completes requisite length of service with good conduct and becomes payable on the succeeding day."*

*(para 24)*

*"In isolation of the purpose it serves the fixation of day succeeding the date of entitlement has no intelligible differentia nor any object is to be achieved by it. The central government servant retiring on 30<sup>th</sup> June has already completed a year of service and the increment has been earned provided his conduct was good. It would thus be wholly arbitrary if the increment earned by the central government employee on the basis of his good conduct for a year is denied only on the ground that he was not in employment on the succeeding day when increment became payable."*

*“In the case of a government servant retiring on 30<sup>th</sup> of June the next day on which increment falls due/becomes payable loses significance and must give way to the right of the government servant to receive increment due to satisfactory services of a year so that the scheme is not construed in a manner that it offends the spirit of reasonableness enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The scheme for payment of increment would have to be read as whole and one part of Article 151 of CSR cannot be read in isolation so as to frustrate the other part particularly when the other part creates right in the central government servant to receive increment. This would ensure that scheme of progressive appointment remains intact and the rights earned by a government servant remains protected and are not denied due to a fortuitous circumstance.”*

6.6 The Allahabad High Court in the case of Nand Vijay Singh (*supra*) while dealing with the same issue has observed and held in paragraph 24 as under: -

*“24. Law is settled that where entitlement to receive a benefit crystallises in law its denial would be arbitrary unless it is for a valid reason. The only reason for denying benefit of increment, culled out from the scheme is that the central government servant is not holding the post on the day when the increment becomes payable. This cannot be a valid ground for denying increment since the day following the date on which increment is earned only serves the purpose of ensuring completion of a year's service with good conduct and no other purpose can be culled out for it. The concept of day following which the increment is earned has otherwise no purpose to achieve. In isolation of the purpose it serves the fixation of day succeeding the date of entitlement has no intelligible differentia nor any object is to be achieved by it. The central government servant retiring on 30<sup>th</sup> June has already completed a year of service and the increment has been earned provided his conduct was good. It would thus be wholly arbitrary if the increment earned by the central government employee on the basis of his good conduct for a year is denied only on the ground that he was not in employment on the succeeding day when increment became payable. In the case of a government servant retiring on 30<sup>th</sup> of June the next day on which increment falls due/becomes payable loses significance and must give way to the right of the government servant to receive increment due to satisfactory services*



*of a year so that the scheme is not construed in a manner that it offends the spirit of reasonableness enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The scheme for payment of increment would have to be read as whole and one part of Article 151 of CSR cannot be read in isolation so as to frustrate the other part particularly when the other part creates right in the central government servant to receive increment. This would ensure that scheme of progressive appointment remains intact and the rights earned by a government servant remains protected and are not denied due to a fortuitous circumstance.”*

*6.7 Similar view has also been expressed by different High Courts, namely, the Gujarat High Court, the Madhya Pradesh High Court, the Orissa High Court and the Madras High Court. As observed hereinabove, to interpret Regulation 40(1) of the Regulations in the manner in which the appellants have understood and/or interpreted would lead to arbitrariness and denying a government servant the benefit of annual increment which he has already earned while rendering specified period of service with good conduct and efficiently in the last preceding year. It would be punishing a person for no fault of him. As observed hereinabove, the increment can be withheld only by way of punishment or he has not performed the duty efficiently. Any interpretation which would lead to arbitrariness and/or unreasonableness should be avoided. If the interpretation as suggested on behalf of the appellants and the view taken by the Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court is accepted, in that case it would tantamount to denying a government servant the annual increment which he has earned for the services he has rendered over a year subject to his good behaviour. The entitlement to receive increment therefore crystallises when the government servant completes requisite length of service with good conduct and becomes payable on the succeeding day. In the present case the word “accrue” should be understood liberally and would mean payable on the succeeding day. Any contrary view would lead to arbitrariness and unreasonableness and denying a government servant legitimate one annual increment though he is entitled to for rendering the services over a year with good behaviour and efficiently and therefore, such a narrow interpretation should be avoided. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the Madras High Court in the case of P. Ayyamperumal (supra); the Delhi High Court in the case of Gopal Singh (supra); the Allahabad High Court in the case of Nand Vijay Singh (supra); the Madhya Pradesh High Court in the case of Yogendra Singh Bhadauria (supra); the Orissa High*



*Court in the case of AFR Arun Kumar Biswal (supra); and the Gujarat High Court in the case of Takhatsinh Udesinh Songara (supra). We do not approve the contrary view taken by the Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in the case of Principal Accountant-General, Andhra Pradesh (supra) and the decisions of the Kerala High Court in the case of Union of India Vs. Pavithran (O.P.(CAT) No. 111/2020 decided on 22.11.2022) and the Himachal Pradesh High Court in the case of Hari Prakash Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors. (CWP No. 2503/2016 decided on 06.11.2020).*

*7. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above, the Division Bench of the High Court has rightly directed the appellants to grant one annual increment which the original writ petitioners earned on the last day of their service for rendering their services preceding one year from the date of retirement with good behaviour and efficiently. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the Division Bench of the High Court. Under the circumstances, the present appeal deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed. However, in the facts and circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs."*

*12. The principle thus applicable for the grant of notional annual increment earned by an employee for rendering service with good conduct in a preceding year/specified period even though he retired the next day has thus to be equally applicable to the grant of the MACP benefit on completion of 8, 16, 24 years of service, if otherwise available.*

*13. In view of the judicial pronouncements referred to above, we hold that the applicant is entitled to the financial upgradation as per the MACP Scheme under the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC on the date of discharge i.e. 01.12.2010 with the benefit of Grade Pay of the rank of the next higher rank with all pensionary and consequential benefits, as he has completed full eight years of service in the rank of Sgt from 01.12.2002 to 30.11.2010. "*

11. Furthermore, we draw an analogy with the facts herein to those as observed vide order dated 24.11.2025 in OA 3720 of 2025 in *Sgt Ratnesh Kumar (Retd) vs UOI & Ors* and in *Sgt Narendra Tiwari (Retd) vs UOI & Ors* in OA 3805 of 2025 dated 01.12.2025 and a catena of the orders of this Tribunal. Thus, in view of our

observations hereinabove and the settled law in view of the order dated 19.05.2015 in OA 1641 of 2013 in *Banarasi Dass* (supra), the OA 253 of 2026 is allowed with directions to the respondents to grant the benefit of the financial upgradation as per the MACP scheme for the next higher rank of "*Nb Sub*" to the applicant with effect from 01.06.2025 i.e. the next date of completion of eight years of regular service in the rank of "*Dfr*" with all consequential benefits within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order, *failing which*, the respondents are liable to pay interest at the rate of 8% per annum to the applicant till the date of actual payment.

12. No order as to costs.

(JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA)  
MEMBER (J)

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

AP  
28.01.2026