

12.05.2022

Petitioner present through counsel.

Notice of the instant execution petition be issued to respondents for submission of implementation report. To come up for implementation report on 15.06.2022 before S.B




(Rozina Rehman)
Member (J)

15th June 2022

Petitioner present in person. Mr. Kabirullah Khattak, Addl. AG alongwith Nasrullah, Inspector (Legal) for the respondents present.

2. Learned AAG produced copy of the order bearing Endst. No. 2574-84/PA/SSP/Coord: dated 09.02.2022, implementing the judgment of this Tribunal. Therefore, this petition is disposed of accordingly. Consign

4. *Pronounced in open court in Peshawar and given under my hand and seal of the Tribunal this 15th day of June, 2022.*






(Kalim Arshad Khan)
Chairman

Form- A
FORM OF ORDER SHEET

Court of _____

Execution Petition No. 58/2022

S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1	20.01.2022	<p>The execution petition of Mr. Sheryar Ahmad submitted today by Mr. Taimur Ali Khan Advocate may be entered in the relevant register and put up to the Court for proper order please.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> REGISTRAR</p> <p>This execution petition be put up before S. Bench at Peshawar on <u>25/02/2022</u>.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> CHAIRMAN</p>
2	25.02.2022	<p>Due to retirement of the Worthy Chairman, the Tribunal is defunct, therefore, case is adjourned to 12.05.2022 for the same as before.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> Reader.</p>



OFFICE OF THE
SSP COORDINATION
CAPITAL CITY POLICE OFFICER
PESHAWAR
Phone No. 091-9213757


ORDER

Ex-SI Imran ud Din, ^{1375/P} and Ex-SI Sheryar ^{86/P} of CCP Peshawar were awarded the major punishment of dismissal from the service by the then SSP Operations vide order dated 28.12.2020 on the charges of subjecting one Radi Ullah al as Amir Tehkaly to inhuman and degrading treatment. A criminal case vide FIR No. 710 dated 24.06.2020 u/s 166/342/355 PPC read with 118,119 of KP Police Act, 2017 & 20/21/22 & 24 of Cyber Crime Act, 2016 was registered in PS Tehkal.

In this regard, they filed departmental appeals which were rejected vide separate orders dated 20.04.2020.

Being aggrieved of the orders, Ex-SI Imran ud Din and Ex-SI Sheryar instituted a service appeal No. 6599/2021 and No. 6598/2021 respectively "titled Sheryar Ahmad versus Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and two others" before the Honorable Service Tribunal Peshawar were accepted and ordered that the impugned orders dated 28.12.2020 and 20.04.2021 is set aside and the appellants are reinstated into service.

In light of the Tribunal Judgment, DSP Legal opinion & kind approval of W/CCPO, Ex-Imran ud Din and Ex-Sheryar of CCP are hereby re-instated in service with immediate effect; hence, intervening period is treated as leave of the kind due.


(Waseem Ahmad Khalil)
SSP COORDINATION
FOR CAPITAL CITY POLICE OFFICER
PESHAWAR

No. 2574-84 /PA-SSP/Coord: Peshawar the 09/02 2022

Copy of above is forwarded for information & n/action to the:

- ✓ Capital City Police Officer, Peshawar.
- ✓ AIG Establishment, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
- ✓ AIG Legal, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
- ✓ SSP Operation, CCP Peshawar.
- ✓ AD IT CCP Peshawar.
- ✓ Office Supdt: CCP Peshawar.
- ✓ Pay Office, CC Branch, EC-I, EC-14
- ✓ Official concerned.

**BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL,
PESHAWAR.**

Execution Petition No. 58 /2022
In Service Appeal No.6599/2021



Sheryar Ahmad Ex-S.I No.86/P,
Police Station Tehkal, Peshawar.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The Provincial Police officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
2. The Capital City Police Officer, Peshawar.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Police (Operation) Peshawar.

RESPONDENTS

.....
**EXECUTION PETITION FOR DIRECTING THE
RESPONDENTS TO IMPLEMENT THE
JUDGMENT DATED 22.12.2021 OF THIS
HONOURABLE TRIBUNAL IN LETTER AND
SPIRIT.**
.....

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

1. That the petitioner has filed service appeal No.6599/2021 in the Honourable Tribunal against the order dated 28.12.2020, whereby the petitioner was dismissed from service and against the order dated 20.04.2021, whereby the departmental appeal of the petitioner has been rejected for no good grounds.
2. The said appeal was heard by this Honourable Service Tribunal on 22.12.2021. The Honourable Service Tribunal accepted the appeal, set aside the impugned order dated 28.12.2020 and 20.04.2021 and reinstated the petitioner into service. The intervening period was

treated as leave of the kind due. (Copy of judgment dated 22.12.2021 is attached as Annexure-A)

3. That the Honourable Tribunal accepted the appeal and reinstated the petitioner into service on 22.12.2021, but after the lapse of about one month the petitioner was not reinstated by the respondents.
4. That in-action and not fulfilling formal requirements by the respondents after passing the judgment of this Honourable Service Tribunal, is totally illegal amount to disobedience and Contempt of Court.
5. That the judgment is still in the field and has not been suspended or set aside by the Supreme Court of Pakistan, therefore, the department is legally bound to obey the judgment dated 22.12.2021 of this Honourable Service Tribunal in letter and spirit.
6. That the petitioner has having no other remedy except to file this execution petition for implementation of judgment dated 22.12.2021 of this Honourable Tribunal.

It is, therefore, most humbly prayed that the respondents may kindly be directed to implement the judgment dated 22.12.2021 of this Honourable Service Tribunal in letter and spirit. Any other remedy, which this august Service Tribunal deems fit and appropriate that, may also be awarded in favour of petitioner.

Sheryar Ahmad

PETITIONER

Sheryar *Ahmad*

THROUGH:

Ali


(TAIMUR ALI KHAN)

ADVOCATE HIGH COURT

AFFIDAVIT

It is affirmed and declared that the contents of the execution petition are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Sheryar Ahmad



BEFORE THE KP SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR

APPEAL NO. 6599 /2021

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal

Diary No. 5249

Date: 19/5/2021

Sheryar Ahmad, Ex-S.I No. 86/P,
Police Station Tehkal, Peshawar.



(APPELLANT)

VERSUS

1. The Provincial Police Officer; Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
2. The Capital City Police Officer, Peshawar.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Police (Operation) Peshawar.

(RESPONDENTS)

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER
PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT, 1974 AGAINST
THE ORDER DATED 28.12.2020 WHEREBY THE
APPELLANT WAS DISMISSED FROM SERVICE AND
AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 20.04.2021 WHEREBY THE
DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS
BEEN REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUNDS.


Filed to-day

19/5/2021

PRAYER:

THAT ON ACCEPTANCE OF THIS APPEAL, THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 28.12.2020 AND 20.04.2021 MAY KINDLY BE SET-ASIDE AND THE RESPONDENTS MAY BE DIRECTED TO REINSTATE THE APPELLANT INTO HIS SERVICE WITH ALL BACK AND CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS. ANY OTHER REMEDY WHICH THIS AUGUST TRIBUNAL DEEMS FIT AND APPROPRIATE THAT MAY ALSO BE AWARDED IN FAVOUR OF THE APPELLANT.

Certified to be true copy


CHAIRMAN
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal,
Peshawar





ORDER
22.12.2021

Learned counsel for the appellant present. Mr. Noor Aman Khattak, District Attorney for the respondents present. Arguments heard and record perused.

Vide our detailed judgment of today, passed in Service Appeal bearing No. ,6599/2021 "titled Imran-Ud-Din Versus Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and two others" the instant appeal is accepted. The impugned orders dated 28-12-2020 and 20-04-2021 are set aside and the appellants are re-instated into service. The intervening period is treated as leave of the kind due. The respondents still have an option under the provisions contained in Rule 16:2(2) of Police Rules, 1934, if decision in the criminal case was found adverse. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to record room.


ANNOUNCED
22.12.2021


(AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN)
CHAIRMAN)


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

Certified to be true copy

Date of Presentation of Application 19-01-22
Number of Words 800
Copying Fee 5/0/-
Urgent 14/1/-
Total 19/0/-
Name of Copyist _____
Date of Completion of Copy 19-01-22
Date of Delivery of Copy 19-01-22


OFFICER
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal
Peshawar

BEFORE THE KP SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR



APPEAL NO. 6598 /2021

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal

Diary No. 5250

Dated 19/5/2021

Imran-Ud-Din, Ex-S.I No. 1375/P,
Police Station Agha Mir Jani Shah, Peshawar.

(APPELLANT)

VERSUS

1. The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
2. The Capital City Police Officer, Peshawar.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Police (Operation) Peshawar.

(RESPONDENTS)

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER
PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT, 1974 AGAINST
THE ORDER DATED 28.12.2020 WHEREBY THE
APPELLANT WAS DISMISSED FROM SERVICE AND
AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 20.04.2021 WHEREBY THE
DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS
BEEN REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUNDS.

Filed to-day

Registrar

19/5/2021

PRAYER:

THAT ON ACCEPTANCE OF THIS APPEAL, THE
IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 28.12.2020 AND 20.04.2021 MAY
KINDLY BE SET-ASIDE AND THE RESPONDENTS MAY BE
DIRECTED TO REINSTATE THE APPELLANT INTO HIS
SERVICE WITH ALL BACK AND CONSEQUENTIAL
BENEFITS. ANY OTHER REMEDY WHICH THIS AUGUST
TRIBUNAL DEEMS FIT AND APPROPRIATE THAT MAY
ALSO BE AWARDED IN FAVOUR OF THE APPELLANT.

ATTESTED
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal
Peshawar

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Service Appeal No, 6598/2021

Date of Institution ... 19.05.2021

Date of Decision ... 22.12.2021



Imran-Ud-Din, Ex-S.I No.. 1375/P, Police Station Agha Mir Jani Shah, Peshawar
(Appellant)

VERSUS

The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and two others.
(Respondents)

Asif Yousafzai,
Advocate ... For Appellant

Noor Zaman Khattak,
District Attorney ... For respondents

AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN ... **CHAIRMAN**
ATIQU-UR-REHMAN WAZIR ... **MEMBER (EXECUTIVE)**

JUDGMENT

ATIQU-UR-REHMAN WAZIR MEMBER (E):- This single judgment shall dispose of the instant service appeal as well as the connected Service Appeal bearing No. 6599/2021 "titled Sheryar Ahmed Versus Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and two others" as common question of law and facts are involved therein.

02. Brief facts of the case are that the appellants, while serving as SHOs in police stations, were charged in FIR Dated 24-06-2020 U/Ss 166/342/355PPC read with section 118 & 119 of Police Act, 2017 and section 20/21/22 and 24 of cyber crime Act, 2016. Consequently, the appellants were arrested and proper criminal procedure initiated against them. Simultaneously, departmental proceedings were also initiated against them and were ultimately awarded with

ATTESTED
SECRETARY
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal
Peshawar

major punishment of dismissal from service vide order dated 28-12-2020. Feeling aggrieved, the appellants filed separate departmental appeals, which were also rejected vide order dated 20-04-2021, hence the instant service appeals with prayers that the impugned orders dated 28-12-2020 and 20-04-2021 may be set aside and the appellants may be re-instated in service with all back benefits.

03. Learned counsel for the appellants has contended that the impugned orders are against law, facts and norms of natural justice, hence not tenable and liable to be set at naught; that the appellants has not been treated in accordance with law and their rights secured under the Constitution has badly been violated; that the appellants were not afforded appropriate opportunity of defense, as no regular inquiry was conducted against the appellants; that during the course of disciplinary proceedings, the appellants were behind the bars, inspite they were not associated with proceedings of the inquiry, as such the impugned orders are liable to be set aside on this score alone; that neither statements of the witnesses were recorded in presence of the appellants nor any opportunity was afforded to the appellants to cross-examine such witnesses; that the appellants were not directly charged in FIR, but upon the statement of the complainant u/s 164 CrPc, the appellants were nominated in that criminal case; that no statement of the complainant was recorded in presence of the appellants during the inquiry proceedings, which was a mandatory step in disciplinary proceedings; that no charge sheet was communicated to the appellants inspite of the fact that the appellants were in jail and it was very easy for the respondents to serve show cause notice through superintendent of Jail, which however was not done in case of the appellants; that show cause notice was issued to the appellants on 24-12-2020, which was received by Superintendent of Jails on 28-12-2020 and handed over to the appellants on the same day; that on the same day i.e. 28-12-2020, the appellants were dismissed from service, which shows malafide on part of the respondents; that the appellants were involved in a criminal case and as per CSR-

ATTESTED

[Signature]
 JUDGE
 JUDICIAL TRIBUNAL
 BANGALORE


194-A, the appellants were required to be suspended from service till the conclusion of the criminal case pending against them, but the respondents without waiting for decision in the criminal case, dismissed the appellants from service in violation of CSR-194.

04. Learned District Attorney for the respondents has contended that the appellants were proceeded departmentally on the charges of subjecting one Radiullah alias Almeray Tehkalay to inhuman and degrading treatment; that a criminal case was also registered against them u/s 166/342/355 PPC read with section 118 and 119 of KP Police Act, 2017 and sections 20/21/22 and 24 of cyber crime Act, 2016; that the appellants were proceeded against departmentally on the same very charges and they were served with charge sheet/statement of allegations and SP City was appointed as inquiry officer; that during the course of inquiry, the inquiry officer found them guilty of the charges leveled against them; that upon receipt of findings of the inquiry officer, the appellants were issued final show cause notices; that after observing all the codal formalities, the appellants were awarded with appropriate punishment of dismissal from service vide order dated 28-12-2020.

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

06. In order to fully appreciate the issue in hand, it would be useful to have a glimpse of the background of the case. Record reveals that a video was made viral on social media by unknown persons, where one Mr. Ridiullah alias Amir Tehkalay can be seen drunken, abusing senior police officers, which attracted wrath of police in shape of an FIR lodged against him in police station Yakatut, thereafter another video of Amir was made viral, where he is seen apologizing for his abusive language in his first video. After few days, another video of the same person went viral, wherein police officials can be seen inflicting brutal torture on him and striping him naked. High-handedness of police in the video came to the

ATTESTED



limelight, which was agitated and condemned from every corner including print and electronic media and which necessitated the senior police officials to take action against those involved in the issue. In the first place, an FIR U/Ss 166/342/355 PPC read with sections 118, 119 of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police Act, 2017 and sections 20/21/22/ & 24 of Cyber Crime Act, 2016 dated 24-06-2020 was registered against three police officials, namely ASI Zahir Ullah and constables Tauseef and Naeem, who can be clearly seen in the video. Amir, the victim, was produced before the court of judicial magistrate, who in his statement dated 01-07-2020 recorded U/S 164 CrPc; interalia had divulged that he was tortured by police on the directions of both the appellants, who at that time were SHO PS Yakatut and PS Tehkal, hence names of the appellants were also inserted in the FIR dated 24-06-2020 and both the appellants were arrested on 01-07-2020.

07. On the other hand, departmental proceedings were also initiated against the appellants. Being involved in a criminal case, the respondents were required to suspend the appellants from service under section 16:19 of Police Rules, 1934, which specifically provides for cases of the nature. Provisions of Civil Service Regulations-194-A also supports the same stance, hence the respondents were required to wait for the conclusion of the criminal case, but the respondents hastily initiated departmental proceedings against the appellants and dismissed them from service before conclusion of the criminal case. It is a settled law that dismissal of civil servant from service due to pendency of criminal case against him would be bad unless such official was found guilty by competent court of law. Contents of FIR would remain unsubstantiated allegations, and based on the same, maximum penalty could not be imposed upon a civil servant. Reliance is placed on PLJ 2015 Tr.C. (Services) 197, PLJ 2015 Tr.C. (Services) 208 and PLJ 2015 Tr.C. (Services) 152.

ATTESTED

EXAMINER
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal
Peshawar

08. Placed on record is charge sheet/statement of allegations dated 03-07-2020 containing the charges as discussed above and probable involvement of the appellants in the brutality and recording and making viral the videos of the victim. Record would suggest that such charge sheet/statement of allegations were not served upon the appellants, as the appellants at that particular time were in jail and it was very easy for the respondents to serve it upon the appellants through superintendent Jail, but the respondents confined its proceedings only to the extent of fulfillment of a formality, which shows malafide on part of the respondents. The allegations so leveled against the appellants are mainly based on the statement of the complainant, but it was responsibility of the inquiry officer to prove the charges leveled by the complainant, but the inquiry officer did not bother to conduct a proper inquiry and while sitting in his office, wrote a two page report, which is of no value in the eye of law. The authorized officer failed to frame the proper charge and communicate it to the appellant's alongwith statement of allegations explaining the charge and other relevant circumstances proposed to be taken into consideration. Framing of charge and its communication alongwith statement of allegations was not merely a formality but it was a mandatory pre-requisite, which was to be followed. Reliance is placed on 2000 SCMR 1743.

09. Report of the inquiry so conducted was submitted on 24-11-2020, but it cannot be termed as a regular inquiry, as the same is replete with deficiencies. The inquiry officer did not bother to associate the appellants with the inquiry proceedings knowing the fact that the appellants are behind the bars, rather he has observed in his report that the appellants were called through summons/parwanas to attend his office, but they did not appear before the inquiry officer. It is ridiculous on part of the inquiry officer summoning a person, who is behind the bars and not taking the pain to attend to them in jail, which clearly shows that neither the appellants were associated with proceedings of the


ATTESTED

EXAMINER
Kashmir High Court
Jammu
Jammu

inquiry nor were they afforded any opportunity to defend their cause. Such an act on part of the inquiry officer is a clear manifestation of professional dishonesty and shirking responsibility, which raises a question as to what would be the evidentiary value of the contents of the inquiry report. The appellants were very clearly discriminated, which however was not warranted. The Supreme Court of Pakistan in its judgment reported as 2008 SCMR 1369 has held that in case of imposing major penalty, the principles of natural justice required that a regular inquiry was to be conducted in the matter and opportunity of defense and personal hearing was to be provided to the civil servant proceeded against, otherwise civil servant would be condemned unheard and major penalty of dismissal from service would be imposed upon him without adopting the required mandatory procedure, resulting in manifest injustice:

10. In the inquiry so conducted, no effort has been made to prove the charges leveled against them, nor statements of any witnesses were recorded. In absence of any solid proof, the inquiry officer only relied on his own wisdom. In a manner, the appellants were deprived of the right to cross-examine witnesses resulting in manifest injustice. Reliance is placed on 2008 SCMR 609 and 2010 SCMR 1554. Since the appellants were in jail, hence, they were unable to appear before the inquiry officer, but the inquiry officer was duty bound to associate them even in jail and to afford them opportunity of personal hearing, which however was not afforded by the respondents and which smacks malafide on part of the respondents. It is a cardinal principle of natural justice of universal application that no one should be condemned unheard and where there was likelihood of any adverse action against anyone, the principle of Audi Alteram Partem would require to be followed by providing the person concerned an opportunity of being heard. The inquiry officer mainly relied on hearsay with no solid evidence against the appellants. Mere reliance on hearsay and that too without confronting the appellants with the same had no legal value and mere

ATTESTED


 WITNESSED
 BY
 THE
 CLERK
 OF
 THE
 COURT

presumption does not form basis for imposition of major penalty, which is not allowable under the law.

11. The respondents issued final show cause notice on 24-12-2020 asking the appellants to respond within seven days of the receipt of such notice. Record would suggest that such notice was received by Superintendent of Jail on 28-12-2020 and was delivered to the appellants the same day, but the respondents were bent upon removing the appellants from service, hence issued their dismissal order on 28-12-2020 without waiting for reply of the appellants, which shows a clear malafide on part of the respondents. We are conscious of the fact that the issue sparked the sense of insecurity at the hands of uniform personnel, besides creating panic in the society, which ultimately created uproar. In order to pacify the sentiments of public, the haste of respondents in making someone a scapegoat is understandable, but awarding major punishment without proving the guilt is not appropriate. Purpose of deterrent punishment is not only to maintain balance with the gravity of wrong done by a person but also to make an example for others as a preventive measure for reformation of society. Concept of minor penalty in law was to make an attempt to reform the individual wrong doer. In service matter, extreme penalty for minor act depriving a person from right of earning livelihood would defeat the reformatory concept of punishment in administration of justice. Reliance is placed on 2006 SCMR 60.

12. Though the appellants were granted bail by order of the Supreme Court of Pakistan vide judgment dated 18-12-2020, but due to a typographical error in the bail granting order, another order was issued by Supreme Court of Pakistan vide judgment dated 24-02-2021 and the appellants were released on bail on 26-02-2021. The criminal case is still pending against the appellants, which will be

ATTESTED

[Signature]
 MEMBER PAKISTAN
 SERVICE TRIBUNAL
 KARACHI

decided on its own merits in due course of time, but it is a well settled legal proposition that criminal and departmental proceedings can run side by side without affecting each other, but in the instant case, we are of the considered

opinion that the departmental proceedings were not conducted in accordance with law. The authority, authorized officer and the inquiry officer badly failed to abide by the relevant rules in letter and spirit. The procedure as prescribed had not been adhered to strictly. All the formalities had been completed in a haphazard manner, which depicted somewhat indecent haste. The allegations so leveled had not been proved. The appellants suffered for longer for a charge, which is not yet proved.

13. In circumstances, the instant appeal, as well as connected Service Appeal bearing No. 6599/2021 "titled Sheryar Ahmed Versus Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and two others" are accepted. The impugned orders dated 28-12-2020 and 20-04-2021 are set aside and the appellants are re-instated into service. The intervening period is treated as leave of the kind due. The respondents still have an option under the provisions contained in Rule 16:2(2) of Police Rules, 1934, if decision in the criminal case was found adverse. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to record room.

ANNOUNCED

22.12.2021



(AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN)
CHAIRMAN)



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

Certified to be true copy

EX-111111
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
Service Tribunal
Peshawar

Date of Presentation of Application 19-01-22

Number of Words 3250

Copying Fee 341/-

Urgent 5/5

Total 385/-

Name of Copyist _____

Date of Completion of Copy 19-01-22

Date of Delivery of Copy 19-01-22

VAKALAT NAMA

NO. _____/2021

IN THE COURT OF KP Service Tribunal, Peshawar

Sheryas Ahmad

(Appellant)
(Petitioner)
(Plaintiff)

VERSUS

Police Deptt

(Respondent)
(Defendant)

I/We, Sheryas Ahmad

Do hereby appoint and constitute **Taimur Ali Khan, Advocate High Court Peshawar**, to appear, plead, act, compromise, withdraw or refer to arbitration for me/us as my/our Counsel/Advocate in the above noted matter, without any liability for his default and with the authority to engage/appoint any other Advocate/Counsel on my/our costs.

I/We authorize the said Advocate to deposit, withdraw and receive on my/our behalf all sums and amounts payable or deposited on my/our account in the above noted matter. The Advocate/Counsel is also at liberty to leave my/our case at any stage of the proceedings, if his any fee left unpaid or is outstanding against me/us.

Dated _____/2021

Sheryas Ahmad
(CLIENT)

ACCEPTED

Taimur Ali Khan
TAIMUR ALI KHAN
Advocate High Court
BC-10-4240
CNIC: 17101-7395544-5
Cell No. 0333-9390916

OFFICE:

Room # FR-8, 4th Floor,
Bilour Plaza, Peshawar,
Cantt: Peshawar