BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR.



Service appeal No. 2413/2021



Syed Hussain Ali Shah	Appellant.
Versus	
District & Sessions Judge Shagla and others	Respondents.
SERVICE APPEAI	

Written reply of above captioned appeal from respondent No.3, SARTAJ

Respect fully sheweth:

- 1. That para No. 01, is not about respondent No. 03 and need no reply.
- 2. That seniority list prepared by respondent No. 02 was against Law and Rules because respondent No. 03 was appointed on 09.09.1996 while appellant was appointed on 13.03.2004.
- 3. That the order of respondent No. 02, dated 04.09.2020 vide which objection petition of respondent No. 03 was dismissed, was not according to law and rules, rest of the para is correct.
- 4. That para No. 04 is correct.
- 5. That para No. 05 needs no reply.
 - A. Para 'A' is incorrect hence denied.
 - B. Para 'B' is incorrect hence denied.
 - C. Pare 'C' is incorrect hence denied.

- D. Pare 'D' is incorrect hence denied.
- E. Para 'E' is incorrect respondent No. 03 was appointed on 09.09.1996 while appellant was appointed on 13.03.2004, so respondent No. 03 is senior than appellant hence, para E is denied.
- F. Para 'F' has no concerned with respondent No. 03 hence needs no reply.
- G. Para 'G' needs no reply from respondent No. 03.

It is therefore most humbly prayed that, on acceptance of this written reply, the above mentioned service appeal may kindly be dismissed with cost.

> Respondent No. 03 Sartaj 15504-2231315-3 03-11-022

Azzidavit :-

I do hereby solomnly affirm of declare on Oath That the Contents of Instant wirthen Reply are true of correct to the best of my knowledge of belief.

