## (See rule 11(1)) ORDER SHEET ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, MUMBAI Form No. 4

## 1. O.A. No.166 of 2021

Capt Ashutosh Kumr Singh
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

Union of India & Others

Versus

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

06.06.2022 Hon'ble Mr. Jus	Notes of Orders of the Tribunal the Registry	
06.06.2022 Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J) Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)	ribunal	

Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondents. Heard Shri H.S. Verma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Shri A.J.

14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for the following reliefs:-Original Application has been filed by the applicant under Section

- 3 That this application be admitted.
- That the respondents be directed to grant Inter Arm/Service transfer to ASC (Army Service Corps) and stop initiation of any action on discharge of the applicant from service.
- (iii) Certificate respondents be directed to and grant medical and service issue Battle waiver for Casualty BYO-155
- 3 necessary in the interest of justice To pass such other and further orders as may be deemed

HTIW service waiver to undergo BYO course enabling him to qualify PI Wpn leg and Being aggrieved, the applicant has filed present O.A. to grant medical and applicant was detailed for PI Wpn leg on various occasions but owing to his due to injury sustained by him in the course and was returned to unit. Platoon Weapon (Pl Wpn) leg, a part of Basic Young Officers (BYO) course category, P2 (P) for PIVD (C4-C5) (OPTD) and P3 (P) for FOCAL SEIZURE Secondary Generalization. The applicant was placed in permanent low medical underwent Anterior Cervical Discectomy (C4-C5) (PEEK CAGE in J&K while descending down the vertical rope during training of Ghatak on 11.03.2017. The applicant sustained injury of PIVD (C4-C5) on 15.04.2019 complete BYO medical condition and employability restriction, he could not attend the course consciousness on 31.08.2019 and was diagnosed with Focal Seizure with GRAFT) surgery at Command Hospital, Udhampur. Thereafter, applicant lost Platoon. He got injured on shoulder and cervical neck region. SECONDARY GENERALIZATION. The applicant could not qualify Brief facts of the case are that applicant was commissioned in the Army The applicant WITH BONE

(iv), sub-section (ii) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007. The application of commission are eligible for IAST and Short Service Commissioned officers Corps) is not included in purview of 'service matters' defined in Section 3(o) pertaining to 3(o) of the Act not otherwise. He further submits that transfer/posting case Tribunal only if it is included in definition of service matters given in application in regard to service matters not eligible for Inter Arm Service Transfer (IAST). He further submits that an Command, filed against the same is not maintainable in the Tribunal. being excluded from the definition of service matters, therefore, application learned counsel for the respondents inter alia on the ground that matter applicant for inter Arm transfer was returned by AMS, HQ Today, during the course of hearing, an objection has been raised by Pune transfer/posting (Inter Arm Service Transfer to Army stating that only officers is maintainable in holding permanent regular Armed Southern Service Section Forces

transfer/posting is excluded from the definition of service matters in Section on the judgment of Armed Forces Tribunal (Principal Bench), New Delhi in O.A. No. 665 of 2020 in the matter of Dfr Shatrughan Singh Tomar vs. Union of present O.A. is barred by maintainability and as such is liable to be dismissed. 3(o) (iv), sub-section (ii) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007, therefore India and Ors, In support of aforesaid submission, learned counsel has placed reliance decided on 07.04.2021. He pleaded that matter of

sent on leave, forcefully. The applicant was placed in low medical category for applicant was not allowed to take proper treatment in Military Hospital and was sustained injury in J&K while doing vertical rope exercise which was sustained during battle training exercise but the same has not been for issue of Battle Casualty Certificate based on all evidences and documents also been rejected by the respondents without considering his injury/medical SECONDARY GENERALIZATION. The applicant approached the respondents and service waiver to complete BYO course and also to transfer him to ASC condition. He pleaded for issuance of Battle Casualty Certificate and medical Service Corps as per IHQ of MoD (Army) policy dated 16.10.2019 which has issued to him. Learned disabilities PIVD (C4-C5) (OPTD) and FOCAL counsel The applicant applied for Inter Arm/Service Transfer to Army for the applicant further submits that in the SEIZURE WITH applicant

as under :-Tribunal Act, The "service matters" as defined in Section 3(o) of the Armed Forces 2007, in so far as it is relevant for the instant case, is reproduced

"3(o) "service matters", in relation to the persons subject to the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957) and the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), mean all matters relating to the conditions of their service and shall include

tenure, including commission, appointment, enrolment

retirement benefits; remuneration (including allowances), pension and other

probation, confirmation, seniority, training, promotion, reversion, premature retirement, superannuation, termination of service and penal deductions,

dismissal is awarded; disposal and trials where the punishment of

(iv) Any other matter, whatsoever,

but shall not include matters relating to

- orders issued under section of 1950), sub-section (1) of section 15 of the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957) and section 18 of the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950); and sub-section (1) of section 15 18 of the Army Act, Of the Navy
- transfers and postings including the change of place or unit on posting whether individually or as a part of unit, formation or ship in relation to the persons subject of the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957) and the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950).

(iii) leave of any kind;

(iv) Summary Court Martial except where the punishment is of dismissal or imprisonment for more than three months;"

area was attributable to military service but it was sustained during training of issued to the applicant being a physical casualty. treated as battle casualty and therefore, battle casualty certificate cannot be Ghatak Platoon while descending down the vertical rope, hence, it cannot be We find that though, the injury sustained by the applicant in operational

service matters of the Section 3(o) (iv), sub section (ii) of the Act and the same defined in Section 3(o) (iv), sub-section (ii) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, same is not cognisable in Armed Forces Tribunal. transfer/posting case being does not fall within the purview of 'service matters' and therefore, the We also find that matter of transfer/posting is excluded in definition of cognizable by the Tribunal. excluded from the definition of service matters Therefore, we are of the view that

dismissed. It is accordingly dismissed In view of the above, the O.A. is devoid of merit and deserves to be

No order as to costs.

Pending applications, if any, are disposed of accordingly

S

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)