30.06.2022

Counsel for the petitioner present. Mr. Shahab Khattak, Legal Advisor for TEVETA present and stated that implementation report in process and seeks time for submission of implementation report. To come for implementation report on 26.07.2022 before S.B.

(Fareeha Paul) Member (E)

26th July, 2022

Petitioner in person present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Addl: AG alongwith Mr. Shahab Khattak, Legal Advisor for respondents present.

SEAMMED KRST Comawad

Learned AAG has assured that he will coordinate with the respondents to get the judgment implemented and submit implementation report on the next date. To come up for implementation report on 27.09.2022 before S.B.

(Kalim Arshad Khan) Chairman

Form- A FORM OF ORDER SHEET

Court of	
Execution Petition No	217/2022

S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1	14.04.2022	The execution petition of Mr. Sultan Muhammad submitted today by Mr. Javed Ali Ghani Advocate may be entered in the relevant register and put up to the Court for proper order please. REGISTRAR
2-		This execution petition be put up before to Single Bench at Peshawar on 26-05-2021. Original file be requisitioned. Notices to the appellant and his counsel be also issued for the date fixed. Notices also be issued to Respondents to a IR
26.05.	2022	Nobody present for the petitioner. Mr. Kabirullah Khattak, Addl AG alongwith Mr. Shahab Khattak for
		respondents present. Learned AAG seeks time for compliance of judgment of this Tribunal. Granted. To come up for implementation report on 30.06.2022 before S.B. Original appeal also requisitioned.

Kalim Arshad Khan Chairman KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR

CHĘCK LIST

	e litte: SGTT	YES	NO
S#	CONTENTS	163	
1	This Appeal has been presented by:		
2	Whether Counsel/Appellant/Respondent/Deponent have signed	/	
	the requisite documents?		
3	Whether appeal is within time?		
4	Whether the enactment under which the appeal is filed mentioned?		
5	Whether the enactment under which the appeal is filed is correct?		
6	Whether affidavit is appended?		
7	Whether affidavit is duly attested by competent Oath		
8	Whether appeal/annexures are properly paged?		
9	Whether certificate regarding filing any earlier appeal on the subject, furnished?	. /	
10	Whether annexures are legible?		
11	Whether annexures are attested?		
12	Whether copies of annexures are readable/clear?		
13	Whether copy of appeal is delivered to AG/DAG?		/
14	Whether Power of Attorney of the Counsel engaged is attested and signed by petitioner/appellant/respondents?	6	
15	Whether numbers of referred cases given are correct?		
16	Whether appeal contains cutting/overwriting?		
17	Whether list of books has been provided at the end of the appeal?		
18	Whether case relate to this court?		
19	Whether requisite number of spare copies attached?		
20	Whether complete spare copy is filed in separate file cover?		
21	Whether addresses of parties given are complete?		<u> </u>
22	Whether index filed?		
	Whether index is correct?		
24	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\		
-	Whether in view of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Service Tribunal Rules		
25			
20	been cent to respondents? On		
26	Whether copies of comments/reply/rejoinder submitted? On		
27	Whether copies of comments/reply/rejoinder provided to opposite party? On	/	
L	opposite Party.		

It is certified that formalities/documentation as required in the above table have been fulfilled.

Name:

Signature: Dated:

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL.

Execution Petition m. 217/2022

SCANNED KPST Peshawar

Appeal No.424/2019

INDEX

S.No.	Description of documents.	
1	Implementation application with affidavit.	1-2
2	Attested copy of order/ judgment dated 31.01.2022	3-9
3	Copy of application	19
4	Wakalatnama.	814

Petitioner/ Appellant

Through

Javed Ali Ghani

Aman Wah Khan Advocates High Court

Peshawar.

Dated: 06.04.2022

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL,

PESHAWAR.

Execution letition no. 217/2022 Services
Diary No.

Appeal No.424/2019

Dated 14-4-2022

Sultan Muhammad s/o Ahmad Ali Shah

Director Physical Education

Govt. College of Technology, Mingora Appellant

Versus

- Secretary Industry Commerce and Technical Education Department,
 Civil Secretariat, Peshawar.
- 2) Govt. of KP through Secretary Finance, KP, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar.
- 3) Govt. of KP through Secretary Establishment Department, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar.
- 4) Managing Director Khyber Pakhtunkhwa TEVETA Headquarters, Peshawar.

...... Respondents

APPLICATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF JUDGMENT/ ORDER OF SERVICE TRIBUNAL DATED 31.01.2022

Respectfully Sheweth;

- 1) That this Hon'ble Tribunal vide order dated 31.01.2022 accepted appeal of applicant/ petitioner. (Attested copy of judgment/ order dated 31.01.2022 is attached).
- 2) That petitioner approached the concerned authorities/ respondent No.1 for the implementation of judgment/ order dated 31.01.2022 but he paid no heed. (Copy of application is attached

- That respondent are not implementing the order/ judgment dated 31.01.2022 of this hon'ble Tribunal and have committed clear contempt.
- 4) That justice demands that judgment of this Hon'ble Tribunal may please be implemented in true letter and spirit.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that respondents may please be directed to implement the order/ judgment dated 31.01.2022 in true letter and spirit and all the benefits be awarded after the decision of the Hon'ble Tribunal.

Petitioner/ Appellant

Through

Javed Ali Ghani

Aman Ukah Khan Advocates High Court

Peshawar.

AFFIDAVIT

I, do hereby affirm and declare on oath that the contents of the **Application** are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Hon'ble Tribunal.

CNIC 15602-3422200-7



BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKIITUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR Khy

Khyber Pakhtukhwa Service Tribunat

Appeal No. 424 2019

Diary No. 501

Bated 01/4/2019

Sultan Muhammad, Director of Physical Education Gov Polytechnic Institute Mingora, Swat.

(Appellant)

VERSUS

- 1. Govt of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Industry Commerce and Technical Education Department Peshawar.
- 2. Govt of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Finance Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar
- 3. Govt of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Establishment Department Peshawar.
- 4. Managing Director Khyber Pakhtunkhwa TEVETA Head quarters Peshawar.

(Respondents)

Appeal under Section 4 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Service Tribunal Act, 1974 for allowing / antedating Seniority / Promotion to BPS-18, against which his Departmental Appeal dated 05.12.2018 was not responded despite the lapse of 90 days.

Filedto-day

Registrar.

1/1/19

Prayed in Appeal:

Registrar

On acceptance of this Appeal the respondents may kindly be directed to allow the appellant seniority / promotion to BPS-18 on the basis of 25 % promotion Quota of sanctioned posts from BPS 17 to BPS 18 in the light of Notification date 27.02.2006 as similar relief has been granted to the colleagues of the appellant with all arrears and benefits.

Passing of the Control of the Contro

ORDER 31.01.2022

Adeel Butt, learned Additional Advocate General for official respondents No. 1 to 3 present. Mr. Ali Gohar Durrani, legal Advisor for respondent No. 4 present. Arguments heard and record perused.

Vide our detailed judgment of today, passed in service appeal bearing No. 412/2019 titled Syed Jamal Shah Versus Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Industry Commerce and Technical Education Department Peshawar and three others, the instant service appeal is accepted as prayed for. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to the record room.

ANNOUNCED 31.01.2022

(AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN) CHAIRMAN

(ATIQ-UR-REHMAN WAZIR) MEMBER (E)

06/4/22

10/

3/4/22

AD



BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Service Appeal No. 412/2019

Date of Institution

01.04.2019

Date of Decision

31.01.2022

Syed Jamal Shah, Librarian Government College of Technology, Tangi, District Charsadda. ... (Appellant)

VERSUS

Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Industry Commerce and Technical Education Department, Peshawar & Others. ... (Respondents)

Mr. Zartaj Anwar,

Advocate

For Appellant

Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt,

Additional Advocate General

For respondents No. 1 to 3.

Mr. Ali Gohar Durrani,

Legal Advisor,

For respondent No. 4.

AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN ATIQ-UR-REHMAN WAZIR

•••

CHAIRMAN

MEMBER (EXECUTIVE)

JUDGMENT

ATIQ-UR-REHMAN WAZIR MEMBER (E):- This single judgment shall dispose of instant service appeal as well as the following connected service appeals, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein:-

- 1. Service Appeal No. 410/2019 titled Javed Iqbal,
- 2. Service Appeal No. 411/2019 titled Alamgir Shah,
- 3. Service Appeal No. 424/2019 titled Sultan Muhammad
- 4. Service Appeal No. 425/2019 titled Muhammad Akram
- 5. Service Appeal No. 426/2019 titled Abdul Aziz
- 6. Service Appeal No. 427/2019 titled Khalid Saleem

ATTESTED



The appellants in the instant service appeal and the connected service 02. appeals are Librarians-BPS-17 and Director Physical Education (DPE) BPS-17. Both are employees of respondent No. 1 and both the cadres are sailing in the same boat with respect to the issue in hand. Briefly stated facts of the case are that the appellants were initially appointed as Librarian/DPEs BPS-16 on regular basis. The posts in respect of both the cadres were up-graded to BPS-17 vide order dated 15-08-2008 only for those holding the requisite qualification, but later on such posts were up-graded on regular basis to BPS-17 vide notification dated 23.02.2011 but with immediate effect, which however was required to be affected from the date of acquiring the prescribed degree. Feeling aggrieved, the appellants filed departmental appeals followed by Service Appeal No. 1342/2011 by Librarians and Writ Petition No. 4137-P/2016 by DPEs. The Service Tribunal as well as the High Court accepted their appeals vide judgment dated 08-06-2015 by the service tribunal and vide judgment dated 05-09-2017 by the High Court. The respondents challenged the judgment of Service Tribunal before the august Supreme court in Civil Petition Nos. 415 to 424, 426 to 438, 511 to 514-P of 2015, which were dismissed vide judgment dated 06.05.2016, hence the respondents did not prefer to contest the judgment of High, hence the respondents allowed up-gradation from the date of acquiring the requisite qualification vide order dated 28.09.2016. The episode went well to the extent of up-gradation from the date of acquiring the prescribed qualification, but on the other hand, the Government Of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa vide notification dated placement of 25 % of the sanctioned posts of . 27.02.2006 had approved Librarians/DPEs BPS-16 in BPS 17 and 25% from BPS-17 to Senior Scale BPS 18. Other colleagues of the appellants were allowed senior scale BPS-18 and the appellants on the same analogy, submitted appeals before the respondents, which was worked out by the respondent department and out of sanctioned posts, five posts falling to the share of BPS-18 @ of 25% of sanctioned posts, but as a result of afterthought, the same was refused to the appellants. Feeling

ISTAD WINER Politica Poshaw



aggrieved, the appellants filed departmental appeal dated 05.12.2018, which was not responded within statutory period, hence the present appeals with prayers to allow the appellants seniority/promotion to BPS-18 from the date of entitlement alongwith all consequential benefits on the basis of 25% promotion quota of sanctioned posts from BPS-17 to 18 on the strength of notification dated 27-02-2006 as similar relief has already been granted to the colleagues of the appellants.

- 03. Learned counsel for the appellants has contended that the respondent department extended the benefit of BPS-18 on regular basis against the existing vacancies to other Librarians namely Sarwar Ullah and Ali Akbar while the appellants has been discriminated; that the appellants were holding the requisite qualification, hence after serving for more than five years as such, they were entitled to Senior Scale BPS-18 as per notification dated 27-02-2006; that even in a judgment reported as PLD 2013(SC)-195 the august Supreme Court has held that the statutory provisions, rules regulation which govern the matter of appointment of Civil Servants must be followed honestly and scrupulously; that respondent have discriminated the appellants by allowing promotion to their other colleagues and refusing the same to the appellants.
- 04. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the respondents has contended that previously the posts of Librarians/DPEs were in BPS-16. There was no further structure available for their promotion and keeping in view this hardship, the Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Industries, Commerce & Technical Education Department vide its notification dated 27.02.2006 devised a structure for them whereby 25% of the total sanctioned posts of Librarians/DPEs BPS-16 were placed in BPS-17 while 25% of BPS-17 of the same cadres were placed in BPS-18. However, later on, all the posts of Librarians/DPEs BPS-16 were upgraded to BPS-17 vide Notification dated 15.08.2008 and 23-02-2011 and now none of these posts exists in BPS-16. Now

AMINER HE STEEL ST



due to changed positions of the posts, a question arises that in the absence of BPS-16, how 25% of the posts in BPS-17 is to be allocated for further 25% allocation in BPS-18; that in pursuance of the judgment of this Tribunal the appellants were allowed BPS-17 from the date of appointment with all benefits for having acquired Master Degree in Library Science; that so far as promotion to the post of Senior Scale BPS-18 is concerned, the department has no justification for creation of posts in BPS-18; that the appeal being devoid of merit may be dismissed. Learned counsel for respondent No.4 relied upon the arguments of learned Additional Advocate General.

05. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record.

Crux of the issue is that the appellants being Librarians/DPEs in BPS 17 06. against regular sanctioned posts, has invoked jurisdiction of notification dated 27.02.2006, which allows placement of 25% of the sanctioned posts of Librarians/DPEs BPS-16 in BPS-17 and 25% of BPS-17 posts of the same cadres in BPS-18. The respondents had already exercised the formula by granting promotions against posts falling in the share of 25% and vide notification dated 28-04-2014 had promoted other colleagues of the appellants. Record would suggest that the respondents had also processed case of promotion of appellants at some length, which would show that 5 posts are falling to the share of the appellants and the appellants are otherwise fit for promotion in respect of seniority and qualification, but the respondents at a belated stage realized that since the notification dated 27-02-2006 was a hardship incentive at the time, when the post of librarian was in BPS-16 and now the post is upgraded to BPS-17, in a situation, the incentive falling in the share @ 25% of BPS-16 vanished away, but the respondents deliberately avoiding the share @ 25% of BPS-17 to BPS-18, which is still intact, as the said notification is neither rescind nor

superseded and is still in field and it would be interesting to note that

9

respondents had already made promotions in pursuance of the notification dated 27-02-2006, even after up-gradation of post to BPS-17, hence contention of the respondents does not hold ground. In a situation, denial of right of promotion would be discriminatory to the effect, that similar relief had already been granted to similarly placed employees against their existing vacancies, which does not require creation of posts, hence concern of the respondents regarding creation of posts is not tenable. Equity and fair play demands that the appellants also deserve the same treatment being the senior most and otherwise eligible.

07. In view of the above, instant appeal as well connected appeals are accepted as prayed for. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to the record room.

ANNOUNCED 31.01.2022

> (AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN) CHAIRMAN

(ATIQ-UR-REHMAN WAZIR) MEMBER (E)

Certified to be ture copy

Service Tribunal.

Case of Presentation of Application 6 & [4]

Copying line ______

D A Completion of Copy—

lower of Fiolisers of Cobs.



Secretary Industry Commerce and Technical Education Department, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar

APPLICATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION **HON'BLE OF** THE **JUDGMENT PESHAWAR** TRIBUNAL, **SERVICE** IN **PASSED** 31.01.2022 **DATED** S.A.No.424/2019

Sir,

Please comply the order/ judgment dated 31.01.2022 passed by Hon'ble Service Tribunal, Peshawar passed in S.A.No.424/2019 in letter, spirit and obliged. (Certified copy attached).

Applicant

Sultan Muhammad Director Physical Education

Govt. College of Technology

Mingora

CNIC No. 15602.3422200-7

Cell: <u>0343 - 1980098</u>

Dated: 15.02.2022

دعوى 7.

باعث تحريرا نكه

مقدم مندور عنوان بالامیں اپی طرف سے داسطے بیردی دجواب دہی دکل کاردائی متعلق میں اس اور اور کاردائی متعلق میں ا آن مقام <u>مستسیم میں کیلے جامع مرملی منی رمند رمامی اسد</u> میں دیار مقرر کر کے اقر ارکیا جاتا ہے۔ کہ صاحب موصوف کومقدمہ کی کل کاروائی کا کامل اختیار ، وگا نیز وکیل صاحب کوراضی نامه کرنے وتقرر ثالت ہ فیصلہ برحلف دیتے جواب دہی اورا قبال دعوی اور بسورت وگری کرنے اجراء اورصولی چیک وروبیارعرضی دعوی اور درخواست برسم کی تقدیق زرایی پردستخط کرانے کا اختیار ہوگا۔ نیزصورت عدم پیردی یا ڈگری بیطرفہ یا بیل کی براید گی اورمنسوخی نیز دائر کرنے اپیل نگرانی ونظر ثانی و پیروی کرنے کا اختیار ہوگا۔ از بصورت ضرورت مقدمہ ندکور کے کل یاجزوی کاروائی کے واسطے اور وکیل یا مختار قانونی کواہیے ہمراہ یا اپنے بجائے تقرر کا ختیار موگا _اور صاحب مقرر شده کومیمی و بی جمله ند کوره باا ختیارات حاصل مون محےاوراس کاسا خته برواختة منظور قبول موكا _ دوران مقدمه مين جوخر چه د جرجانه التوائع مقدمه كےسبب سے وہوگا۔ کوئی تاریخ بیشی مقام دورہ پر ہویا صدیے باہر ہوتو وکیل صاحب پابند ہوں مے کہ بیروی ند کورکریں ۔لہذا و کالت نامہ کھدیا کہ سندر ہے ۔