Form- A FORM OF ORDER SHEET

Court of		
Execution Petition No.	228 /2022	
EXECUTION FELLION NO.	220/2022	

	Execu	ution Petition No. 228/2022
S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1	15.04.2022	The execution petition of Mr. Badar Jamil submitted today Mr. Muhammad Arshad Khan Tanoli Advocate may be entered in the relevant register and put up to the Court for proper order please. REGISTRAR
2-	31.5.222 21/8/22	This execution petition be put up before touring Single Bench at A.Abad on 16-06-2027. Original file be requisitioned. AAG has noted the next date. The respondents be issued notices to submit compliance/implementation report on the date fixed.
	16.06.2022	Petitioner present in person present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Assistant Advocate General present. Despite directions notices were not issued. Therefore, fresh notices be issued to respondents for the date fixed. To come up for implementation report on 17.08.2022 before S.B at Camp Court Abbottabad. (Fareeha Paul) Member (E) Camp Court A/Abad

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE SERVICE TRIBUNAL KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA PESHAWAR

C.M No. 228 /2022 IN Service Appeal No. 88/2015

Badar Jamil Ex-SI/PC, Lower Kohistan.

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

Regional Police Officer, Hazara Range, Abbottabad & others..

... RESPONDENTS

APPLICATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION

INDEX

S. #	Description	Page #	Annexures
1.	Application	1 to 4	
2.	Copy of service appeal	5-13	"A"
3.	Copy of judgment dated 19.07.2018	14-17	"B"

Dated: ______/2022

Continue Through

(Muhammad Arshad Khan Tanoli)

Advocate Supreme Court of Pakistan

at Abbottabad

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE SERVICE TRIBUNAL KHYBER

<u>PAKHTUNKHWA PESHAWAR</u>

C.M No. 228 /2022

Service Appeal No. 88/2015

Badar Jamil Ex-SI/PC, Lower Kohistan.

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

- 1. Regional Police Officer, Hazara Range, Abbottabad.
- 2. District Police Officerr, Lower Kohistan.

...RESPONDENTS

APPLICATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF JUDGMENT DATED 19.07.2018 PASSED BY THIS HONOURABLE TRIBUNAL IN APPEAL NO. 88/2015 TITLED "BADAR JAMIL VS. GOVT. OF KPK" & OTHERS.

Respectfully Sheweth:-

1. That applicant/ appellant filed above mentioned service appeal No. 88/2015 against impugned act of respondents by awarding major penalty of dismissal from service despite of fact that the

applicant suffering from kidney disease and was unable to serve from 07.08.2014 to 09.09.2014. Detailed of which fully mentioned in the head-note of appeal. Copy of service appeal is annexed as Annexure "A".

- 2. That on 19.07.2018 after hearing of arguments, this Honourable Tribunal partially allowed the appeal of the applicant/ appellant to the extent that the impugned order passed by the appellate authority dated 26.12.2014 is set-aside and the case is remanded back to the said authority for decision afresh with the direction to take into consideration facts and circumstances of the case and give full opportunity of hearing to the appellant. This Honourable Court is further directed to the concerned authority to dispose off the departmental appeal of the appellant within a period of three months from the date of receipt of this judgment. Copy of judgment dated 19.07.2018 is annexed as Annexure "B"
- 3. That thereafter, the appellant appeared before respondents for implementation of judgment dated 19.07.2017 of this Honourable Tribunal, but the respondents straight away refused to implement the same.
- 4. That more than 04 years have been elapsed of passing of judgment dated 19.07.2018 of this Honourable Tribunal, but the respondents have failed to implement the same.

5. That the respondents instead of complying with the direction of this Honourable Tribunal, straightaway refused to comply with the direction of this Honourable Tribunal.

6. That other point would be raised at the time of arguments with kind permission of this Honourable Tribunal.

It is therefore, humbly prayed that on acceptance of instant application respondents be kindly be directed implement the Judgment dated 19.07.2018 of this Honourable Tribunal in its true letter and spirit, failing which contents of court proceedings may be initiated against the respondents.

...APPLICANT/ APPELLANT

Through

Dated: /2022

hammad Arshad Khan Tanoli)
ocate Supreme Court of Pakistan
at Abbottabad

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE SERVICE TRIBUNAL KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA PESHAWAR

C.M No	/2022
I	N
Service Appe	al No. 88/2015

Badar Jamil Ex-SI/PC, Lower Kohistan.

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

Regional Police Officer, Hazara Range, Abbottabad & others..

...RESPONDENTS

APPLICATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION

AFFIDAVIT

I, *Badar Jamil Ex-SI/PC*, *Lower Kohistan*, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare that the contents of foregoing application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed therein from this Honourable Tribunal.

DEPONENT



BEFORE HONOURABLE SERVICE TRIBUNAL KHYBER PAKHTUNKHAWA, PESHAWAR

Annex-A

Service Appeal No. _____/2015

P- 5

Badar Jameel, Ex-S.I / P.C, Lower Kohistan.

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

- 1. Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Home & Tribal Affairs KPK, Peshawar.
- 2. Provincial Police Officer KPK, Peshawar.
- 3. Regional Police Officer Hazara Range, Abbottabad.
- 4. District Police Officer, Lower Kohistan.

....RESPONDENTS

Musled

Minaminal Archad Whith Willell

Advocate Supreme Court of Posistan

Advocate # 33 Jinnan Plaza Adjacom to

Office # 33 Jinnan Plaza Adjacom to

Distt: Bar Abbottabad

SERVICE APPEAL

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF KPK SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT 1974 FOR DECLARATION TO THE EFFECT THAT APPELLANT WAS SUFFERING FROM KIDNEY DECEASE AND WAS UNABLE TO SERVE FROM 07/08/2014 TO 09/09/2014, HENCE, RESPONDENT NO. 4 ILLEGALLY AWARDED MAJOR PUNISHMENT OF COMPULSORY

SERVICE TO THE RETIREMENT **FROM** APPELLANT VIDE IMPUGNED ORDER NO. 960-BY**PASSED** 09/09/2014 DATED 61/PA RESPONDENT NO. 4. FOLLOWING THIS, THE APPELLANT FILED DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL **ORDER** TO **IMPUGNED** THE **AGAINST** RESPONDENT NO. 3 FOR CONVERTING OF **COMPULSORY** OF PENALTY **MAJOR** RETIREMENT TO REINSTATEMENT IN SERVICE, BUT RESPONDENT NO. 3 WHILE REJECTING DISMISSED DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL, ORDER APPELLANT VIDE **IMPUGNED** 11381/PA DATED 26/12/2004, WHICH IS ILLEGAL, PERVERSE, ARBITRARY, AGAINST THE LAW, WITHOUT LAWFUL JUSTIFICATION AND AS A RESULT OF NON-READING OF RECORD AND SERVICE APPEAL AND THE SAME IS LIABLE TO BE SET ASIDE.

Arched Willes, Land Advocate Supreme Court of Facilities and to Office # 33 Jinnah Plans Action To Disit: Bar Abbottatad

PRAYER: ON ACCEPTANCE OF THE INSTANT APPEAL, IMPUGNED COMPULSORY RETIREMENT ORDER AND IMPUGNED REJECTION LETTER NO. 11381/PA DATED 26/12/2014 BE DECLARED VOID, ILLEGAL AND

RESPONDENTS NO. 2 TO 4 MAY GRACIOUSLY BE DIRECTED TO REINSTATE THE PETITIONER IN SERVICE WITH ALL SERVICE BENEFITS IN TERMS OF PAY ETC.

ORDER NO. 5023-35/SEI DATED 11/09/2014 MAY BE DECLARED ILLEGAL, WITHOUT LAWFUL **CODAL** OF **DEVOID** JUSTIFICATION FORMALITIES, WITHOUT ORDERING OF PROPER BOARD OF INQUIRY TO ENQUIRE AS TO WHETHER, THE APPELLANT DID NOT conduct PROPER INVESTIGATED THE CASE TITLED "STATE V/S BANARAS etc." IMPUGNED Reversion ORDER DATED 11/09/2014 OF THE APPELLANT FROM DSP TO INSPECTOR MAY BE SET ASIDE AND RESPONDENT NO. 2 MAY GRACIOUSLY BE DIRECTED TO RESTORE RANK OF DSP OF THE APPELLANT W.E.F THE DA, TE OF REVERSION I.E. 11/09/2014 WITH ALL IN**TERMS OF** PAY, BENEFITS BACK ALLOWANCES AND SENIORITY ETC.

Alistel

Respectfully Sheweth: -

It may please your lordship.

- 1. That the appellant served in the Police Department for 29 years and served the department with complete devotion and dedication.
- 2. That, the appellant was suffering from multifarious kidney deceases and remain under treatment w.e.f 07/08/2014 to 09/09/2014. (Copy of O.P.D tickets are attached as annexure "A").
- 3. That, following this, respondent No. 4 without issuing charge sheet, show cause notice and conducting enquiry regarding absence period of the appellant and illegally awarded major punishment i.e. compulsory retirement from service vide impugned order No. 960-61/PA dated 09/09/2014. (Copy of impugned compulsory retirement is annexed as Annexure "B").
 - 4. That, following this, the appellant filed departmental appeal to the next higher authority i.e. respondent No. 3 for converting of compulsory retirement of the appellant into his reinstatement vide departmental appeal dated 11/09/2014. (Copy

Allestel

of departmental appeal is annexed as Annexure "C").

- 5. That, respondent No. 3 without reading appeal of the appellant rejected departmental appeal of the appellant and also hold "After thorough probe into the enquiry report and the comments of DPO Lower Kohistan, it came to light that the punishment given to him by the DPO Lower Kohistan i.e dismissal from service is genuine. Therefore, appeal is dismissed and filed" vide impugned order No. 11381/PA dated 26/12/2014. (Copy of impugned rejection letter is attached as Annexure "D").
- 6. That, the act of respondent No. 3 is illegal and as a result of non-reading of record and departmental appeal of the appellant. Hence, impugned rejection letter is liable to be set-aside.
- 7. That, feeling aggrieved, the instant departmental appeal is filed, inter-alia, on the following amongst many others grounds:-

GROUNDS:-

- a. That, as per Revised Leave Rules, 1981, once medical documents regarding illness of an employee is submitted, the competent authorities are bound to consider and grant medical leave to the ailing employee.
- b. That, in case, it appears to the competent authority that the medical documents of an employee are fake, the same are to be submitted to the next medical authority as per KPK Revised leave Rules, 1981. But, respondents did not comply with the rules and leave impugned orders of compulsory retirement and rejection letter of departmental appeal are liable to be setaside.
- c. That, no charge sheet, show cause notice and enquiry conducted in the case of the appellant. Therefore, the appellant is entitled to be reinstated in service.
- d. That, the appellant was on the posted strength of District Police Officer, Upper

Allested

e.

Allested

Kohistan, whereas order of compulsory retirement has been passed by District Police Officer, Lower Kohistan which is not maintainable at law.

That, respondent No. 3 did not considered appeal of the appellant at appropriate remedy even he did not go through the appeal and dismissed departmental appeal holding "After thorough probe into the enquiry report and the comments of DPO Lower Kohistan, it came to light that the punishment given to him by the DPO Lower Kohistan i.e dismissal from service is genuine. Therefore, appeal is dismissed and filed" which is arbitrary and against the law. Hence, the same is liable to be dismissed.

- f. That, this Honourable Court should not fold up its hand while granting relief to the aggrieved appellant as per law.
- g. That, this fact may not be left to fade in obedient that respondent No. 3 decided

departmental appeal of the appellant at his own whims and wishes without resorting to his judicious mind.

- h. That, the respondents have led the appellant to placed which is utterly unknown to the principal of juris-prudence and good administration of justice. Justice demand that when law on the subject prescribed something which is to be done in a particularly manner that must be done in that manner and not otherwise.
- i. That, the appeal of the appellant is within time and this Honourable Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain the same.
- j. That, other points would be agitated at the time of arguments.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that on acceptance of the instant appeal, impugned compulsory retirement order and impugned rejection letter No. 11381/PA dated 26/12/2014 be declared void, illegal and respondents No.

P-13

2 to 4 may graciously be directed to reinstate the petitioner in service with all service benefits in terms of pay etc.

...APPELLANT

Through;

Dated: /2015

Muhammad Arshad Khan Tanoli) Advocate High Court, Abbottabad

VERIFICATION: -

Verified on oath that the contents of forgoing appeal are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed therein from this Honourable Court

...APPELLANT

Annex - B

BEFORE HONOURABLE SERVICE TRIBUNAL KHYBER PAKHTUNKHAWA, PESHAWAR

P-14

Service Appeal No. _ 88 /2015

26-1-201

Badar Jameel, Ex-S.1 / P.C, Lower Kohistan.

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

- 1. Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Home & Tribal Affairs KPK, Peshawar.
- 2. Provincial Police Officer KPK, Peshawar.
- 3 Regional Police Officer Hazara Range, Abbottabad.
- 4. District Police Officer, Lower Kohistan. --

....RESPONDENTS

SERVICE APPEAL

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF KPK SERVICE
TRIBUNAL ACT 1974 FOR DECLARATION TO THE
EFFECT THAT APPELLANT WAS SUFFERING
FROM KIDNEY DECEASE AND WAS UNABLE TO
SERVE FROM 07/08/2014 TO 09/09/2014, HENCE,
RESPONDENT NO. 4 ILLEGALLY AWARDED

ATTESTED

PUNISHMENT OF COMPULSORY

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKITTUNKITWA SERVICE TRIBUS CAMP COURT, ABBOTTABAD.

Service appeal No. 88/2015

Date of institution ...
Date of decision

26.01.2015 19.07.2018

Badar Jameel, Ex-S.I/P.C, Lower Kohistan.

(Appellant)

<u>Versus</u>

Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary, Home & Tribal Affairs KPK, Peshawar and 3 others. ... (Respondents)

<u>Present</u>

Mr. Muhammad Arshad Khan Tanoli,

Advocate

For appellant.

Mr. Usman Ghani,

District Attorney

For respondents.

MR. SUBHAN SHER, MR. MUHAMMAD AMIN KHAN KÜNDI. CHARMAN

MEMBER.

JUDGMENT

SUBHAN SHER, CHAIRMAN:-

Relevant facts of the present appeal, stated in brief are that the appellant was appointed as Constable and during his long service for 29 years, he reached to the rank of S.I. That from 07.08.2014 to 09.09.2014, he remained absent for which his explanation was called, followed by issuance of charge sheet and statement of allegations, conducting enquiry and final show cause notice by the competent authority i.e. respondent No. 4. In short, he was held responsible for his wilful absence from duty and was imposed major penalty of compulsory retirement from service vide order dated 09.09.2014. Appellant preferred a departmental appeal

A100. 7.61

aggrieved of both the orders, the appellant impugned the same through the instant appeal before this Tribunal.

- 3. Arguments heard and file perused.
- 4. Mr. Muhammad Arshad Khan Tanoli, Advocate at the very outset of the arguments assailed the impugned orders particularly of the appellate authority by contending that the said authority did not bother to go through the impugned order passed by the competent authority i.e. respondent No. 4 but dismissed the appeal by mentioning that the dismissal from service of the appellant was rightly passed by the D.P.O whereas in fact, the appellant was compulsorily retired from service. He also challenged the enquiry proceedings and at the end, he requested to accept the appeal and set aside the impugned orders and reinstate the appellant with all back benefits.
 - 5. Mr. Usman Ghani, District Attorney vehemently opposed the contentions of the learned counsel for the appellant and stated that after completion of all the procedural formalities of enquiry, the appellant was found guilty and the punishment was rightly passed. That being a member of disciplined force, he should not have absented himself from duty without permission. Further contended that the findings of the appellate authority, in fact is nothing but a clerical mistake and the same could be corrected by this Tribunal. Lastly, he requested this Tribunal to dismiss the appeal of the appellant.
- 6. After going through the record and particularly the impugned order passed by the appellate authority dated 26.12.2014, this Tribunal is of the view that it will not be advisable to deeply discuss the merits of the case or pass any remarks on the particularly versions of the learned counsel for the parties lest, it may prejudice the interest of either party but would confine our finding to the omission committed

by the appellate authority i.e. respondent No. 3. The appellant had challenged his compulsory retirement from service but the appellate authority in clear words stated in the impugned order that "the punishment given to him by the DPO Lower Kohistan i.e. dismissal from service is genuine", is totally against the record as stated above he was compulsory retired from service. In short, this glaring omission afone is sufficient to invoke the interference of this Tribunal under its appellate jurisdiction.

As such, this appeal is partially allowed to the extent that the impugned order passed by the appellate authority dated 26.12.2014 is set aside and the case is remanded back to the said authority for decision afresh, with the direction to take into consideration facts and circumstances of the case and give full opportunity of hearing to the appellant. So, for this purpose the departmental appeal before the appellate authority is deemed to be pending. The appellate authority is further directed to dispose of the appeal within a period of three months, from the date of receipt of this judgment. In the circumstances, parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to the record room.

Amounced Self Subhan Sher, 19.07.2018 Self Subhan Sher, Canficonst A/Abad. Canficonst A/Abad. Member.

Certified to be ture copy

Date of Presentation of Applic

chairm	nan sewice TX	burned Kpeshows : is
Per	منجانب: منجانب:	. وعوىٰ:
Ba	Barranil	علت نمبر:
4000		موری
2814	Charlo Later	جرم: تقانه
	رب آنکه	مع شواء

مقدمه مندرج عنوان بالای اپی طرف سے واسطے پیروی وجواب وہی کاروائی متعلقہ

آن مقام اسٹر کر اپرا اسلی اپی طرف سے واسطے پیروی وجواب وہی کاروائی کاکال اختیار ہوگا، پیرزو بیاضا حب کو راضی نامہ کرے وقع رقال دیو نام اور کی کاروائی کاکال اختیار ہوگا، پیرزو بیاضا حب کو زر سے کر دی تقول کے دیا کہ کا افغال دیو کا افزار کی بیاضر فی بیز در سے دور کا افغال دیو کا افزار کی بیاضر فی بیز در کا افغال ہوگا کا دور کی بیاض کی برا می کاروائی کا دور کی بیاض کی برا می کاروائی کا دور کی بیاض کی برا می کاروائی کا دور کی بیاض کی بی

نوك:اس وكالت نامه كى فوتوكانى نا قابل قبول موكى_