



2025:DHC:8828-DB



\$~21

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 15009/2025, CM APPL. 61768/2025 & CM APPL.
61769/2025

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Santosh Pandey, SPC and
Mr. Yash Maurya, Adv.

SGT, Mr. Manish Kumar Singh and SGT
Mritunjay, Air Force Legal Cell.

versus

681120 EX HFO RAVINDRA KUMAR RAMRespondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

%

26.09.2025

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. This petition, at the instance of Union of India, assails order dated 9 November 2023 passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal in OA 1175/2023¹. By the said OA, the respondent sought disability pension. The respondent had been found to be suffering from primary hypertension to the extent of 30% for life rounded off to 50%. The respondent was, therefore, released on that ground after thirty eight years and two months after he joined service.

2. The report of the Relief Medical Board provides the following reasons for holding that the respondent's hypertension was not attributable to the military service:

¹ HFO Ravindra Kumar Ram v UOI



Disability	Attributable to service (Y/N)	Aggravated by service (Y/N)	Detailed Justification
Primary Hypertension (old) I10, Z09	No	No	A lifestyle related disease. Onset on Sep 2015, while posted to Delhi and T/D to sulur both are peace stations. There is no close time association with stress & strain of field/HAA/CI Ops of service. Therefore, disability is neither attributable nor aggravated by Military service in terms of para 43 of Chapter VI of Guide to Medical Officer (Military Pension 2008)

3. In similar petitions, in which identical grounds have been cited by the medical board, following the decision of Supreme Court in *Dharamvir Singh v UOI*², *Bijender Singh v Union of India*³ as well as *Union of India v Ex Sub Gawas Anil Madso*⁴, we have held that the respondent is entitled to disability pension.

4. Accordingly, the Armed Forces Tribunal cannot be said to have erred in law or in fact. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

5. The petitioner is directed to comply with the directions of the AFT within twelve weeks from today.

² (2013) 7 SCC 316

³ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 895

⁴ (2025) 318 DLT 711



2025:DHC:8828-DB



6. The respondent would be entitled to broadbanding from the date of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Ram Avtar*⁵.

7. Arrears, if any, would only be paid for the period of three years prior to institution of the OA before the Tribunal.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/AT

⁵ Union of India v Ram Avtar, 2014 SCC OnLine SC 1761