Form- A FORM OF ORDER SHEET

Court of	
Execution Petition No.	671/2022

	Exc	ecution Petition No. 671/2022
S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1	10.11.2022	The execution petition of Mr. Adnan Khan
		submitted today by Mr. Mir Zaman Safi Advocate. It is
	•	fixed for implementation report before Single Bench at
		Peshawar on Original file be
		requisitioned. AAG has noted the next date. The
	•	respondents be issued notices to submit
		compliance/implementation report on the date fixed.
		By the order of Chairman REGISTRAR
:		

Implementation Petition No. 671 /2022 In

Appeal No.458/2018

ADNAN KHAN

VS

POLICE DEPTT:

INDEX

S.NO.	DOCUMENTS	ANNEXURE	PAGE NO.
1-	Memo of petition		1- 2.
2-	Affidavit	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	3.
3-	Judgment	A	4- 7.
4-	Order dated 22.06.2022	В	8.
5-	Order sheet	C	9- 10.
6-	Vakalat nama		11.

PETITIONER APPLICANT

THROUGH:

MIR ZAMAN SAFI ADVOCATE MOBILE NO.0333-9991564 0317-9743003

Implementation Petition No. 67) /2022 her Pathytukhwa
In

Appeal No.458/2018

Butcd 10-11-2022

Mr. Adnan Khan S/O Mumtaz Ali, R/O Mohallah Saleem Khan Dheri, Village Saleem Khan, Mardan.

APPELLAN

VERSUS

- 1- The Inspector General of Police, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
- 2- The Regional Police Officer, Mardan Region, District Mardan.
- 3- The District Police Officer, District Mardan.

 RESPONDENTS

IMPLEMENTATION PETITION FOR DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS TO OBEY THE JUDGMENT OF THIS AUGUST TRIBUNAL DATED 14.01.2022 IN LETTER AND SPIRIT

R/SHEWETH:

- 1- That the petitioner filed Service appeal bearing No. 458/2018 before this august Service Tribunal against the impugned dismissal order dated 30.01.2015.
- That appeal of the petitioner was finally heard by this august Tribunal on 14.01.2022 and was decided in favor of the petitioner vide judgment dated 14.01.2022 with the view that "In view of the situation, we are inclined to partially accept the appeal. The appellant is re-instated in service by converting the major penalty of his dismissal into minor penalty of stoppage of two increments. The intervening period is treated as leave of the kind due". Copy of the judgment is attached as annexure.A.
- 3- That after obtaining attested copy of the judgment dated 14.01.2022 the petitioner submitted the same alongwith an application before the respondents for implementation but the respondents were not willing to do so.
- 4- That the petitioner feeling aggrieved filed execution petition before this august Tribunal and during the pendency of aforementioned execution petition the respondent department partially implemented the judgment of this Honorable Tribunal by conditionally re-instated the petitioner vide order dated 22/06/2022

- 5- That it is pertinent to mention that the respondent department issued the order dated 22/06/2022 only to the extent of reinstatement which is against the spirit of the judgment of this august Tribunal dated 14.01.2022.
- 6- That the petitioner has no other remedy but to file this implementation petition.

It is, therefore, most humbly prayed that on acceptance of this implementation petition the respondents may very kindly be directed to also implement the remaining portion of the judgment regarding back benefits passed by this august Tribunal vide dated 14.01.2022 in letter and spirit. Any other remedy which this august Tribunal deems fit that may also be awarded in favor of the petitioner.

PETITIONER

ADNAN KHAN

THROUGH:

MIR ZAMAN SAFI ADVOCATE

Implementation Petition No.____/2022

Appeal No.458/2018

ADNAN KHAN

VS

POLICE DEPTT:

AFFIDAVIT

I Mir Zaman Safi, Advocate on behalf of the petitioner, do hereby solemnly affirm that the contents of this implementation petition are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Honorable Tribunal.

MIR ZAMAN SAFI ADVOCATE

Service Appeal No. 458 /2018

Adnan Khan S/o Mumtaz Ali
R/o Mohallah Saleem Khan Dheri,
Village Saleem Khan, Tehsil & District Mardan
Ex-Constable Police Department, K.P, District Mardan

.....Appellant

VERSUS

- 1. Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Home & Tribal Affairs Department, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar.
- 2. Inspector General of Police, Police Department, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
- 3. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Mardan/ Regional Police Officer, Mardan.
- 4. District Police Officer, Mardan.

.....Respondents

SERVICE APPEAL U/S 4 OF SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT, 1974 AGAINST FINAL DATED **ORDER** APPELLATE 26.01.2017, PASSED BY RESPONDENT 24.01.2018 ON (RECEIVED NO.2 OWN EFFORTS) HIS **THROUGH** PASSED ON DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL UNDER RULE 11-A OF KP POLICE RULES, 1975 AND ORDER DATED 13.02.2015 PASSED BY RESPONDENT NO.3 AND ORDER DATED 30.01.2015 BY RESPONDENT PASSED

ATTESTED

M. Comer

ATTESTED AND REAL PROPERTY.

Service Appeal No. 458/2018

Date of Institution ...

09.02.2018

Date of Decision

14.01.2022



Adnan Khan S/o Mumtaz Ali R/o Mohallah Saleem Khan Dheri, Village Saleem Khan, Tehsil & District Mardan Ex-Constable Police Department, K.P., District Mardan.

VERSUS

Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Home & Tribal Affairs Department, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar and others. (Respondents)

Naila Jan, Advocate

For Appellant

Muhammad Rasheed, Deputy District Attorney

For respondents

AHMAD SULTAN TAREEN ATIQ-UR-REHMAN WAZIR CHAIRMAN MEMBER (EXECUTIVE)

JUDGMENT

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

Brief facts of the

case are that the appellant was appointed as Constable vide order dated 02-08.2009. During the course of his service, the appellant was proceeded against on the charges of absence from duty and was ultimately dismissed from service vide order dated 30-01-2015, against which the appellant filed departmental appeal, which was also rejected vide order dated 12-03-2015. The appellant filed revision petition, which was also rejected vide order dated 26-01-2017 communicated to the appellant on 24-01-2018, hence the instant appeal with prayers that the impugned orders dated 12-03-2015 and 30-01-2015 and 26-01-

TESTED TRENER

2017 may be set aside and the appellant may be re-instated in service with all back benefits.

(b)

O2. Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that the appellant has not been treated in accordance with law, as the appellant has not been associated with proceedings of the inquiry; that absence of the appellant was not intentional, rather due to compelling reason of illness of his wife, which was not taken into consideration; that the appellant has been proceeded against exparte, thus was deprived of the opportunity to defend his cause; that absence on medical ground does not constitute gross misconduct entailing major penalty of dismissal from service.

Learned Deputy District Attorney for the appellant has contended that the appellant willfully absented himself from lawful duty without permission of the competent authority; that plea of the sickness of his wife is baseless, non-reliable and is false, hence denied; that proper departmental inquiry was conducted against the appellant and the appellant was afforded opportunity to prove his innocence but the appellant did not join the inquiry proceedings; that departmental appeal as well as revision petition of the appellant were considered but were rejected being devoid of merit; that the instant appeal of the appellant being devoid of merit may be dismissed.

- 04. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record.
- 05. Record reveals that the appellant was served with charge sheet/statement of allegation dated 02-12-2014, to which he responded and presented medical prescription in respect of his wife, who reportedly was having issue in her spinal cord. The inquiry officer in his report has taken into consideration illness of his wife and also checked medical prescriptions, but he neither termed it fake nor sent it for verification but reiterated that the appellant was supposed to inform

ATTESTED ATTER

the authorities well in time about such illness, hence his absence amounts to misconduct, which deserve to be awarded with major punishment. It is a well settled legal proposition that leave on medical grounds even without permission of the competent authority does not constitute gross misconduct entailing major penalty of dismissal from service. Reliance is placed on 2008 SCMR-214. The inquiry officer was supposed to take a lenient view, instead he recommended him for major punishment, which appears to be harsh. We have observed that the appellant has not been treated in accordance with law, as no final show cause notice was served upon him, thus deprived him of the opportunity to prove his innocence. The disciplinary proceedings were also conducted in absence of the appellant and the appellant was not associated with proceedings of the inquiry, thus the respondents skipped a mandatory step prescribed in law.

- We are of the considered opinion that absence of the appellant was not willful but due to illness of his wife and stance of the appellant was considered to some extent by the inquiry officer, but neither such stance of the appellant was regretted nor the medical prescriptions were sent for verification, despite he was recommended for major penalty, which to our opinion appears to be harsh.
- In view of the situation, we are inclined to partially accept the appeal. The appellant is re-instated in service by converting the major penalty of his dismissal into minor penalty of stoppage of two increments. The intervening period is treated as leave of the kind due. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be M. Commer. consigned to record room.

ANNOUNCED 14.01.2022

CHAIRMAN

Printed to be thre compile-ur-rehman wazir) MEMBER (E)



OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT POLICE OFFICER, MARDAN

Tel No. 0937-9230309 & Fix No. 0937-9230333 Email dpo_inerdant-lyshop com

ORDER

Consequent upon the filing of execution petition [25] 293/2012 by Ex-Constable Adnan No. 3081 for the implantation of the order [35] Honorable Service Tribunal, KP announced on 27.01.2022 in service appeal [25] 458/2018, "the major penalty of dismissal from service awarded to Ex-Constable Adnan No.3081 vide this office OB No. 188 dated 30.01.2015 is set aside and he is conditionally re-instated in service on acquisition of bail bonds and treating his intervening period as leave of the kind due with immediate effect subject to the outcome of CPLA after the Scrutiny Committee of Law department has determined the instant case fit for filing CPLA in the meeting held on 27.04.2022".

1... 10. 1352

Dated. 22/06/2022

District Poffice Officer Mardan

364 3595-1EC, dated 2316/2022. Copy for information to the:-

: Superintendent of Police, Operations, Mardan.

District Accounts officer, Mardan.

DSP/Legal

DSP/HQr:

5. PO.

6. PA.

7. OSI

WAKALAT NAMA

BEFORE THE Klyber Pant	tenulua Service
Ty, bunal, Peste	awar
	•
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	OF 2022
	(ADDELLANT)
Adnan Khan	(APPELLANT) (PLAINTIFF)
Honan Muan	(PETITIONER)
	(FEIIIONER)
VEDCIIC	
<u>VERSUS</u>	
	(RESPONDENT)
Police Deptt:	(DEFENDANT)
po suc pepper.	(DDI EIVEIIVI)
I/We Adnan Chan	
Do hereby appoint and constitute	MIR ZAMAN SAFI.
Advocate, High Court, Peshawar	
compromise, withdraw or refer to arb	
Counsel/Advocate in the above noted	
for his default and with the authority	
Advocate Counsel on my/our cost.	and the second of the second o
Advocate to deposit, withdraw and re	
sums and amounts payable or deposite	
above noted matter.	ed on my our decount in the
above noted matter.	
Dated. / /2022	
Datea	d a
	CLIENT
	A limit
	M
	ACCEPTED

MIR ZAMAN SAFI ADVOCATE

OFFICE:

Room No.6-E, 5th Floor, Rahim Medical Centre, G.T Road, Hashtnagri, Peshawar. Mobile No.0333-9991564 0317-9743003