



2025:DHC:11962-DB



\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 19776/2025, CM APPL. 82603/2025 and CM APPL. 82604/2025

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, CGSPC with
Mr. Manish Kumar Singh and Mr.
Mritunjay, DAV Legal Cell Air Force,

versus

EX MWO UMESH CHANDRA MISHRA 649297
.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Baljeet Singh, Ms. Deepika
Sheoran and Mr. Abhishek Gahlyan, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE OM PRAKASH SHUKLA

JUDGMENT (ORAL)
24.12.2025

%

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

1. This writ petition assails an order dated 28 August 2023 passed by the Armed Forces Tribunal¹ in OA 971/2019 whereby the respondent's prayer for disability pension has been allowed.

2. Disability pension was sought on the ground that the respondent suffered from Primary Hypertension which was found to be 30% for life rounded off to 50%. The onset of the Primary Hypertension was 41 years after the respondent joined the service. No Primary



2025:DHC:11962-DB



Hypertension was noted at the time when the respondent was recruited.

3. The reasoning given by the Release Medical Board for holding that the respondent's Primary Hypertension was not attributable to or aggravated by service read thus:

“Primary Hypertension (OLD) I-10, Z-09.0 - (a) The disability is a lifestyle disorder and not due to any infection.
(b) Onset in Peace Area (New Delhi) on Dec 2009. No close time association with field services 1 year prior to onset of disease.
(c) No delay in diagnosis / Treatment
(d) No close time associated with stress and strain of military services like field area / HAA/CI Ops.
(e) Hence, NANA in terms of Para 43 of GMO (Mil Pen) 2008. (Amended)”

4. In around 223 similar cases, in which the reasoning of the RMB is substantially the same, including *Union of India v. Ex. SGT Manoj K L Retd²* and *Union of India v. Rajveender Singh Mallhi³* as well as *Union of India v. Ex Sub Gawas Anil Madso⁴*, we have upheld the order of the AFT and dismissed the writ petition.

5. Those decisions apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the present case.

6. We have not been informed that any of these decisions has been stayed or interfered with by the Supreme Court.

7. Mr. Raj Kumar, learned CGSPC for the Union of India fairly

¹ “AFT”, hereinafter

² 2025 SCC OnLine Del 8442

³ 2025 SCC OnLine Del 3956

⁴ 318 (2025) DLT 711



2025:DHC:11962-DB



acknowledges that this dispute is entirely covered by the aforesaid decisions.

8. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed in *limine*.
9. Compliance with the order of the AFT be positively ensured within twelve weeks from today.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

OM PRAKASH SHUKLA, J.

DECEMBER 24, 2025/yg