

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, CHENNAI

O.A. (Appeal) No. 45 of 2014

Friday, the 06th day of February, 2015The Honourable Justice V.Periya Karuppiah
(Member-Judicial)

and

The Honourable Lt Gen K Surendra Nath
(Member-Administrative)

R.Karthik, Ex WTR 1, 219124-K (aged about 24 years)

S/o Shri Raja Thevar

No.97/144, Vakkil Street, Kovilpatti

Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu – 628 501

...Applicant

By Legal Practitioners:

Mr.B.A.Thayalan and Mrs.Tonifia Miranda

vs

1. Union of India
Rep.by the Secretary
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi – 110 011
2. The Chief of Naval Staff
Naval HQ, Sena Bhavan
New Delhi – 110 011
3. The Flag Officer Commanding-Chief
Headquarters, Eastern Naval Command
Visakhapatnam – 530 014
4. The Commanding Officer
Indian Naval Ship Airavat
C/o Fleet Mail Office
Visakhapatnam – 530 014
5. The Commanding Officer
Indian Naval Ship Gharial
C/o Fleet Mail Office
Naval Base 682 004, Kerala

...Respondents

Mr.E.Arasu, CGSC

ORDER

[Order of the Tribunal made by
Hon'ble Lt Gen K Surendra Nath, Member (Administrative)]

This Original Application has been filed by Ex Wtr 1 R Karthik to call for the records of the Summary Trial conducted on 29th May 2013 by the 5th respondent and to set aside the verdict of the summary trial dated 24 July 2013 by which the applicant was dismissed from service.

2. Briefly, the applicant was enrolled in the Indian Navy as a Writer on 09.04.2008. The applicant states that he excelled in his training and other activities and was awarded with Commendation by the Naval Officer in-Charge, Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry (NOIC) for his outstanding all round performance. He would state that while on service with INS Gharial, at Vizag., he was assigned duties in the Pay Office for preparation of pay bills and payment of salaries and maintenance of records. He would state that on 29.05.2013, the ship INS Gharial sailed to Brunei as part of Joint Naval exercise. He would state that while he was performing duties on the navigational bridge on lookout duty as per the duty roster, there was a sudden announcement in the PA system calling names of persons including his name to report to flight deck. As he was already on the lookout duty on the bridge, he took permission of the Officer on Watch and proceeded to the helicopter deck. The applicant states that the sea was rough and he was sea sick and was totally drained and exhausted. At the helicopter deck, he reported to Petty Officer (Air Handling) Gupta at which time Lt A Vardhan reached the spot and started abusing the applicant for no reason. While he was trying to explain that he was not at fault, due to heavy rolling and pitching of the ship, the applicant lost his balance and fell on Lt Vardhan which the latter took as an assault on him and punched and kicked him on his stomach. The applicant would state that he was tricked and coerced into giving a statement signed by him stating that he had struck superior officer Lt Vardhan. He was promised that they would let him go with a warning by the Captain. When the ship reached Andamans, the Captain's defaulter list took place and he was awarded punishment No. 2

and 9 under the Indian Naval Act. He was kept in open custody in INS Jarawa and on 07.06.2013, the applicant was brought to INS Adyar by flight and on 08.06.2013, he was taken to Vishakapatnam by train where he was kept in close custody in INS Circars, The applicant contends that to his utter shock and surprise, on 24 July 2013, he was informed that he had been dismissed from service. The applicant would claim that his trial was conducted in an arbitrary manner by the Commanding Officer in violation of the provisions of Naval Regulations 27 to 29 and that a statement was taken from him through deceit and fraud and no proper procedures were followed. In view of the foregoing and the fact that he had an unblemished service record since the time he had joined the Navy, the applicant prays that this Tribunal may set aside the verdict of the summary trial dated 24 July 2013 as arbitrary, illegal and *non est* and to reinstate him with all pecuniary benefits such as pay and allowances, seniority and other emoluments from the date of his dismissal.

3. The respondents in their reply statement would not dispute the fact of his enrolment in the Indian Navy on 09.04.2008 and the fact that on 29 May 2013, INS Gharial sailed from Vishakapatnam to Brunei to participate in the exercises. The ship sailed from Vizag at 0830 hrs and was preparing to recover Seaking 42 C helicopter Ex-Dega. At about 0930 hrs, Lt Abhishek Vardhan made an announcement for mustering the Aviation Core team at Helo Hangar. The applicant, Wtr Karthik, being a member of the Aviation Core team remained absent from the place of duty. Lt Abhishek Vardhan who was carrying out duties as the ship's Aviation Officer made several announcements for the applicant to report for duty. However, the applicant reported only after half an hour. On enquiring the reasons for the delay, the applicant started arguing with the officer. In view of the circumstances and the need to recover Seaking helicopter, the officer raised his voice and the applicant replied in a defiant tone to the officer. The respondents aver that the applicant lost his temper and raised his hands and hit the officer in the face. The officer immediately brought the case to the attention of his immediate superiors. The matter was investigated by the Commanding Officer under the relevant provisions of the Naval Act and on investigation, it was *prima facie* found that the

applicant was guilty of hitting a superior officer who was carrying out his duties as ship's Aviation Officer. The applicant pleaded guilty to the charges before the Commanding Officer. Considering the evidence on record and the statements of the witnesses, the charge under Section 45 (a) of the Navy Act, 1957, i.e., striking superior officer was proved beyond any reasonable doubt and the Commanding Officer recommended (a) detention for a period of 60 days (No.2); and (b) deprivation of first Good Conduct Badge (No.9), as punishments. In accordance with Regulation 15 of the Regulations for Navy Part II (Statutory), the case was referred to the administrative authority for approval of the punishment warrant, namely, Commander-in-Chief, Eastern Naval Command. The administrative authority after examining the evidence on record and considering the nature of the offence, reported the matter to the Chief of Naval Staff with a recommendation under Regulation 17 (1) of Regulations for Navy Part II (Statutory) for the following punishments: (a) Dismissal from the Naval Service (No.3); (b) Deprivation of First Good Conduct Badge (No.9). The competent authority, i.e., the Chief of Naval Staff, after examining the evidence and recommendations of the administrative authority, approved the punishment as above. The respondents would aver that the allegations made by the applicant are found baseless and that all procedures were followed in accordance with the Indian Naval Act and rules and procedures were strictly following during the trial. In view of the foregoing, the respondents pray for the original application to be dismissed being devoid of substance.

4. We have heard the arguments of Mr.B.A.Thayalan and Mrs.Tonifia Miranda, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr.E.Arasu, learned Central Government Standing Counsel, assisted by Lt Rahul Ahlawat, Assistant JAG Officer (Navy) and Lt Varun Kulshrestha, Assistant Judge Advocate, Eastern Naval Command, Vishakapatnam appearing for the respondents and perused all documents placed before us.

5. On the pleadings of the counsel from both sides, the following issues/ points have been framed for consideration:

(a) *Were the procedures adopted in the summary trial of the applicant was according to the laid down rules and regulations?*

(b) *Whether the punishment meted out to the applicant was reasonable and justified?*

(c) *What remedy, if any, the applicant is entitled to?*

6. Points 1 and 2: There is no dispute on the fact that INS Gharial sailed from Vishakapatnam at about 0830 hrs on 29 May 2013 for joint exercises with Brunei and at around 1000 hrs, it was to recover a helicopter and to make it land on the helicopter hangar. The fact that an announcement was made by the Aviation Officer to muster his crew in the helicopter hangar and that Wtr I Karthik was part of the Aviation Core Team are also not disputed. The applicant's counsel would state that the applicant did not hear the call initially and when he came a little after 20 minutes, the officer, i.e., Lt Vardhan had abused him and called names of his mother and sister which he could not tolerate and, therefore, in a fit of anger, he hit him once for which he felt sorry and that since the provocation came from the officer himself and as it was only a reflex action in a fit of anger, the applicant should be judged leniently and the punishment of dismissal from service is excessive considering the nature of the offence. He would also state that the procedures adopted in conducting the summary trial was not proper and some witnesses were not even allowed to be cross-examined by the applicant. Further, the Commanding Officer who had tried the applicant on summary trial awarded him (a) detention for a period of 60 days (No.2); and (b) deprivation of first Good Conduct Badge (No.9), as punishments. However, subsequently, without any justification, the punishment was converted into one of dismissal from service which is far excessive for the offence, on the plea that the applicant was a habitual offender in using force. We have carefully examined the proceedings recorded and the evidence produced before the Commanding Officer. Apart from the complainant (i.e., Lt Vardhan) and the applicant, i.e., WTR Karthik, there were no other witnesses to the incident. However, the complainant, i.e., Lt Vardhan had given a statement which, *inter alia*, stated that he used abusive language as the applicant had come late and started arguing with him and as there was immediate action required for

recovering the helicopter lest an accident could take place. The applicant had used force by hitting him on the face after which he reported the matter to his superior officer.

7. On the other hand, the applicant in his statement would state that an announcement was made for him to reach the deck when he did so, Lt Vardhan abused him with words which were derogatory of his mother and sister and as he was feeling seasick and owing to the stress and tension of his work, he lost his temper and struck him and that “this is a mistake and do not know what happened to me at that time. I will never do this kind of mistake ever in my entire service. I feel very badly about this incident and I am asking sorry to Lt Abhishek Vardhan.”

8. For a better understanding of the issue, the two statements of the officers are reproduced below:

Statement of Complainant – Lt Abhishek Vardhan (06243-N)

The ship left harbor on 29 May 13 at about 0830 hrs. We were to receive Seaking C-560 onboard at 1000 hrs and so flying stations was piped and Aviation Core Team was mustered on helo deck. Being the Aviation Officer of the ship, I went to helo deck to prepare the deck for flying. When I mustered the Aviations Core Team, Karthik, WTR 1 was missing. I called up bridge and requested SSD OOW to announce for him. After about 15-20 minutes and 2 more announcements Karthik, Writer I finally came to helo deck. When I asked him about the delay, he said that he had closed for SSD. When I told him that Aviation Core Team was mustered & he should have come, he said that his name is not in Aviations Core Team & that he is standby for Prasad, Cook II. I asked him if he was aware that Prasad was on leave. He said he was aware of it. I asked him again that as he was standby for Prasad and he knew he was on leave, he should have closed up. To this he replied that Chief Writer has told him that as there are only 2 writers onboard, they will not do any duty. I told him to get Chief Writer to helo deck. He then replied that Chief Writer is not onboard & is admitted in hospital. Then I told him to remain on helo deck & once Aviations Core Team is secured, write a statement saying “he came late to helo hanger because Chief Writer had told him not to do any duty”. He then became more aggressive & shouted upon me that “I will not write any statement, Chief writer is hospitalized”. I told him again that it does not make any difference whether Chief Writer is on board or not, he must write a statement at end of Flying Stations. He now shouted on top of his voice saying “Chief Sahab is admitted”. I then lost my cool and shouted back at him abusing him. He then hit me with his fist on my left cheek and abused me. I did not shout at him further or even touch him. I called a Regulating Sailor who was in Helo Hanger & told him to take Karthik, Writer 1 to Executive Officer in bridge. I told the whole episode to the Executive Officer

& EXO took us to Commanding Officer and I apprised him of the situation. After this I was asked to go to helo deck by EXO & ensure safe recovery of SC-560. I composed myself & went to the helo deck for recovering SC-560. After this when at 1400 hrs, Aviation Core Team was asked to muster in helo deck again, Karthik, Writer 1 did not come to helo deck once again. I asked POA (AH) Gupta to announce for him & went to oversee the ground run of SC-560. Post ground run, I was told by POA (AH) Gupta that Karthik, Writer 1 did not come for Aviation Core Team again. I do not think that such an offence should be accepted by anyone and the most strict possible action be taken against the sailor. It was with this faith in Indian Navy that I did not hit the sailor back and I hope that my faith in the system remains so."

Statement of WTR I R Karthik

"Q5 Do you understand the warning?

Ans. Yes Sir

Q6 Do you plead guilty to the charges?

Ans. Yes Sir.

Q7 Do you wish to call any witness in your Defence?

Ans. No Sir.

Q8 Do you wish to say anything in answer to the charges?

Ans. Raja Karthik, WTR 1, No.219124-K stated "On falling out of SSD for leaving harbor, where I was carrying out duties of SSD Lookout, I continued with my lookout duties as 'Red Watch' was closed up. Then I heard one more announcement 'Karthik WTR 1 Helo deck'. So, I went from Bridge Wing to helo deck and was under severe stress due to vomiting and office work. When I reached the helo deck, Lt Abhishek Vardhan saw me and shouted at me 'why you are late to close up, Behenchut. Are you a special person, Behenchut'. I answered him, 'Sir, I am in Red Watch and carrying out look out duties on bridge because of which I was late'. Then he again shouted. I remained calm and replied with a smile that I am the only writer sailor available onboard and that Chief Writer had told me that since I am alone handling all ship's office duties, including cash and public accounts, I will not be put on duties. But still, I am doing the duties sir, I said.

Then Lt Abhishek Vardhan told me 'tell your Chief Writer to give it in writing on paper'. I did not answer him. Then he (Lt A Vardhan) shouted at me 'Behenchut, Madarchut you still have a doubt'. I was feeling seasick and was under stress and tension. Suddenly I lost control over my mind and him on his face.

I know this is a mistake and do not know what happened to me at that time. I will never do this kind of mistake ever in my entire service. I feel very badly about this incident and I am asking sorry to Lt Abhishek Vardhan"

9. From a reading of the above two statements, it is an admitted fact that Lt Abhishek Vardhan was on duty on 29 April 2013 at about 0930 hrs and called for the closing of the Aviation Core Team as a helicopter had to

be secured. However, despite repeated announcements, WTR 1 Karthik who was standby for Prasad, the Cook, did not report to the deck and reported only after the third announcement. When the officer asked the applicant as to why he reported late, the applicant had claimed that he was not required to do any duty as was told by his Chief Writer, who was not aboard the said ship. The officer, i.e., Lt Vardhan got agitated by the applicant's answer, lost his cool and shouted obscenities, as per the statement of the officer. According to him, he lost his cool because the sailor was shouting in an aggressive manner whereas, according to the statement of the applicant, he was allegedly seasick and was late because he was doing other duties as well. The officer had accepted that he had used expletives in Hindi. The applicant had also accepted that he suddenly lost control owing to the abusive language of the officer and hit him in the face. In his defence, the sailor also would admit that he had made a mistake in the heat of the moment and he will not repeat such mistakes and that he apologized and sought forgiveness of the officer. In effect, the applicant has pleaded that the assault inflicted on his superior officer was due to provocation and subsequent loss of self control.

10. Provocation is defined in Black's Law Dictionary as something (such as words or actions) that affects a person's reason and self-control especially causing the person to commit a crime impulsively. Further, reasonable provocation or adequate provocation has been defined as something that would cause a reasonable person to act without self-control and lose any premeditated state of mind. The usual form of adequate provocation is the heat of passion. The Indian Penal Code distinguishes "voluntarily causing hurt" (Sec 321 IPC) and "voluntarily causing hurt on provocation (Sec 334 IPC). Accordingly, the maximum punishment for "voluntarily causing hurt" is one year imprisonment, and / or fine upto Rs.1,000/-. Maximum punishment for "voluntarily causing hurt on provocation" is much less, i.e., upto one month imprisonment and / or a fine of Rs.500/-. For grave or sudden provocation, the following should normally be proved: **(a)** that the accused received provocation; **(b)** the provocation was grave and sudden; and **(c)** that he was deprived by

provocation of his power of self-control. That while first deprived of his power of self-control and before he can cool down, he has caused the injury or assault against the person who gave him the provocation. The burden of proving sudden provocation, would lie on the accused.

11. It is reasonably established that the applicant was well aware that he was a member of Aviation Core Team, that he was on active duty and that he did not report for duty on time when called upon to do so. He had sought to justify his action that he was not required to do the said duty quoting his Chief Writer, who himself was not onboard. Further, the applicant had started arguing with the officer. At the same time, the officer also needs to be faulted for raising his voice on his subordinate and using unparliamentary and abusive language to a sailor which is an unbecoming conduct. The resultant action of assaulting an officer by the applicant appears to be due to the provocation of the abusive language used by the officer for which the applicant, in his statement had pleaded guilty.

12. The second issue that we need to see is that on perusal of the trial documents, it is clear that the complainant had given a statement and that complainant himself was not brought before the accused for cross-examination. All other witnesses who were brought before the trial have denied having seen or heard anything of the incident except to say that Lt Vardhan and Karthik were talking to each other. Therefore, the only admissible evidence produced was the acceptance of guilt by the applicant himself through his statement that he was provoked by the officer for using abusive language and that was why he had lost his cool and hit the officer. There is also the statement recorded by Inquiry Officer of Sea 1 RP III Suraj Pradhan who gave a statement about another incident which allegedly happened in Port Blair in August 2012. He stated that when he passed a comment about the applicant 'showing off his body', the applicant allegedly became agitated and hit him with a soft broom on his right upper hand and pushed him aside. Again this statement of alleged incident appears to have not been made before the applicant, i.e., the accused and, therefore, no opportunity was given to him to cross-examine the witness.

13. From the above, it appears that the enquiry has been done in a ham-handed manner and it ought to have been done more deliberately to bring the facts of the case before the Commanding Officer. The Commanding Officer, in his summary of evidence has recorded that the accused, i.e., the applicant was seasick and picked up an argument with the officer. This resulted in Hindi expletives being used by the officer which agitated the accused (i.e., the applicant) who lost his temper and raised his hands and hit the officer in the face once. The Commanding Officer also recorded that there are no adverse remarks about the behaviour of the accused in the service documents. However, he alluded to the fact that the statement given by Suraj Prasad that a similar incident happened earlier shows the individual had a tendency to use criminal force. This evidence cannot be admissible before law as it was neither recorded before the accused nor was the accused given an opportunity to cross-examine the witness. The Commanding Officer, at the end of the summary trial found the applicant guilty and recommended the following warrant punishments: (a) detention for a period of 60 days (No.2); and (b) deprivation of first Good Conduct Badge (No.9). This trial proceedings were forwarded to the Commander-in-Chief, Eastern Naval Command, being the Administrative authority to approve the said warrant punishments. The C-in-C, Eastern Naval Command, on the advice given by his staff, had forwarded the case to the Chief of Naval Staff with the recommendations that proper punishment for the above offence would be (a) dismissal from Naval service (No.3) and, (b) deprivation of First Good Conduct badge (No.9). In recommending more severe punishment, i.e., dismissal from service, the C-in-C, Eastern Naval Command had justified the punishment stating that the applicant has an aggressive trait wherein he can flay his physical strength as also the need to send a message and set an example to the subordinates and impressionable sailors in the Navy. For a better understanding, extracts of the recommendations are reproduced below:

"1-11 xx xx xx xx

12. *The Service Document do not indicate any adverse remarks with regard to the conduct/aggressive behavior of the accused. However perusal*

of the Summary of Evidence reveals that the accused was involved in another incident of Manhandling Suraj Pradhan, Sea I, RP III No.222062 N onboard. The matter was resolved by the RPO onboard between the two sailors. This is indicative that the accused has an aggressive trait wherein he can flay his physical strength. It is apparent that this is not the first involvement of the sailor in such type of incidents.

13. Though, circumstances leading to scuffle between Officer and accused is mitigated due to poor handling of the situation by Officer. However, it is pertinent to mention, that guilt of the accused has been clearly established. The audacity of the accused to physically and publically retaliate against Officer does not behove marks of respect/adherence of discipline which is expected from a uniformed personnel. It needs to be appreciated, that the demeanor/act exhibited by the accused needs to be viewed seriously. This will send a message/setting example to all, otherwise it is bound to set wrong precedence amongst subordinate/impressionable sailors, if not addressed immediately. The act of using physical force amounts to defiance of authority which needs to be dealt with a heavy hand wherein the punitive action taken should be of deterrence so as to cause fear amongst personnel that such acts will not be tolerated.

14. Perusal of the documents and evidence on record reveals that the Officer used abusive language in dealing with the situation which resulted in accused striking him. The accused on being abused retaliated by using physical force/aggression resulting in committing the offence of striking. The accused in his statement has accepted that he lost his control and hit the Officer on his face.

15. It goes without saying that the Officer handled the situation poorly wherein, he is also being dealt under summary powers of C-in-C. This aspect may be viewed at IHQ in a mitigating manner for benefit of modulating punishment to the accused. However, it is essential, keeping in view the recent trend seen in Fleet Ships that we take a stern stand, since the incident happened whilst discharging duties at sea.

16. CO INS Gharial has rightly arrived in finding the accused guilty of the charge. Personnel who do not respect/give regard to the orders of their superiors are bound to have poor integrity and become liability to the organization in future. The punishment proposed by the CO under the circumstances needs to be enhanced under the Regulations, which will have a deterrent effect upon all concerned.

17. The appropriate punishment for the above offence would be Dismissal from Naval Service (No.3) and Deprivation of First Good Conduct Badge (No.9)."

14. It is admitted by the C-in-C that there was an altercation where there has been a provocation and that the officer, i.e., Lt Vardhan had handled the situation poorly and expressed that this has to be seen as a mitigating factor benefiting the modulation, of the punishment to the accused, i.e., the

applicant. However, it appears that the statement of Sea I RP III Suraj Pradhan given at the inquiry mentioned above has been used as evidence to prove that the applicant had an aggressive trait and to adduce that this is not the first involvement of the applicant in such incidents. As we have seen, the evidence of Sea I RP III Suraj Pradhan is not admissible before law. Further, to buttress the claim, the respondents in their written arguments have stated *“It is pertinent to mention that the decision to award the said punishment also has a rationale from past precedents. During the period this case had occurred there was a sudden rise in the cases of striking Superior Officer by Sailors. A common decision to award punishment of Dismissal from Naval Service was taken so as to send a deterrent message to personnel. Hence, based on the similarity of offence, the facts and circumstance of the case, there was no reason or ground that a different view in the present case could be taken.”*

15. It is a settled principle that in every case, facts and circumstances vary and, therefore, a common punishment for a similar offence cannot be made as a rule which appears to have been the driving force in recommendation of eventual dismissal of the applicant from service. In the extant case, the use of force by the applicant was not premeditated or deliberate but was a consequence of provocation in the form of use of abusive language by a superior officer. It is admitted that it was a reflex action to the provocation; the applicant had immediately cooled down and owned up his mistake voluntarily. It is also admitted that the officer had handled the situation poorly and the use of abusive language to subordinates is an unbecoming act of an officer. To that extent, the offence has to be viewed in the circumstances under which it was committed and the mitigating factors that have been brought before. It has also been admitted by the respondents that Lt Abhishek Vardhan was found guilty of an act of using profane / abusive language against the applicant under Section 74 of Naval Act 1957 (offences against good order and discipline) and was given a punishment of “one month loss of seniority of Lieutenant”.

16. It appears that the punishment given to the officer was light in nature and, therefore, given the extenuating circumstances under which the whole episode occurred, the applicant's plea for mitigation ought to have been considered.

17. Viewed in light of the above, we are of the considered opinion that the sentence of dismissal from service awarded to the applicant by the Chief of Naval Staff is disproportionate and excessive.

18. Point No.3: In view of the aforesaid discussions and conclusions, we are inclined to set aside part of the sentence, i.e., dismissal from Naval service and substitute it with the punishment of 75 days detention (No.2). However, the second part of the sentence, i.e., deprivation of First Good Conduct Badge (No.9) continues to be operative.

19. In sum, the O.A. is partly allowed. The punishment of dismissal from Naval service is set aside and is substituted with the punishment of 75 days detention. The applicant is directed to report to the designated Naval Unit / Establishment within six weeks from today. The punishment of detention will commence from the date of reporting. Any part of the sentence already undergone earlier / time spent in close custody shall be set off against the duration of the punishment. The period of absence from the date of dismissal till the date of reporting for duty shall be treated as non-qualifying service. No pay and allowances shall be admissible for the said period. No order as to costs.

Lt Gen K Surendra Nath
Member (Administrative)

Justice V.Periya Karuppiyah
Member (Judicial)

06.02.2015

Member (J) – Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

Member (A) – Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

ap

To

1. The Secretary
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi – 110 011
2. The Chief of Naval Staff
Naval HQ, Sena Bhavan
New Delhi – 110 011
3. The Flag Officer Commanding-Chief
Headquarters, Eastern Naval Command
Visakhapatnam – 530 014
4. The Commanding Officer
Indian Naval Ship Airavat
C/o Fleet Mail Office
Visakhapatnam – 530 014
5. The Commanding Officer
Indian Naval Ship Gharial
C/o Fleet Mail Office
Naval Base 682 004, Kerala
6. Mr.B.A.Thayalan
Counsel for applicant
7. Mr.E.Arasu, CGSC
Counsel for respondents
8. OIC/Legal Cell,
INS Adyar, C/o Navy Office, Port Complex
Rajaji Salai, Chennai
- 9.. Library, AFT/RB, Chennai.

Hon'ble Justice V.Periya Karuppiah
(Member-Judicial)

and

Hon'ble Lt Gen K Surendra Nath
(Member-Administrative)

O.A.(Appeal) No.45 of 2014

Dated :06.02.2015

