

**ORDER**

12<sup>th</sup> Oct, 2022

1. Learned counsel for the appellant present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Addl: AG for respondents presen.

2. Vide our detailed judgment of today placed in Service Appeal No. 13565/2020 titled "Samiullah-vs-The SMBR, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar and others" (copy placed in this file), this appeal is also decided on the said terms. Costs shall follow the events. Consign.

3. *Pronounced in open court in Peshawar and given under our hands and seal of the Tribunal on this 12<sup>th</sup> day of Oct, 2022.*



**(Kalim Arshad Khan)**  
Chairman



**(Fareeha Paul)**  
Member(Executive)

15.02.2022


Due to retirement of the Worthy Chairman the Tribunal is defunct, therefore, case is adjourned to 13.05.2022 for the same as before.



Reader

13-5-22

*Proper DB not available the case is adjourned on 26-7-22*



Reader

26<sup>th</sup> July 2022

Counsel for the appellant present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Additional Advocate General alongwith Mr. Qasim Khan, Superintendent and Mr. Muhammad Sajjad, Litigation Officer for the respondents present.

Learned counsel for the appellant requested for adjournment on the ground that he has not prepared the brief of the instant appeal. Adjourned. To come up for arguments on 12.10.2022 before the D.B.



(Salah-Ud-Din)  
Member (J)



(Kalim Arshad Khan)  
Chairman

15.03.2021

Due to tour of Camp Court Abbottabad and shortage of Members at Principal Bench Peshawar, the case is adjourned to 24.05.2021 before S.B.

  
Reader

24.05.2021


Due to demise of the Worthy Chairman the Tribunal is defunct, therefore, case is adjourned to 03.08.2021 for the same as before.

  
Reader

03.08.2021

Counsel for the appellant and Mr. Kabirullah Khattak, Addl. AG alongwith Muhammad Sagged, Law Officer for the respondents present.


Written reply/comments have submitted and the same are placed on file. The appeal is entrusted to D.B for arguments on 16.12.2021.


  
Chairman

16.12.2021

Syed Noman Ali Bukhari, Advocate for the appellant present. Mr. Muhammad Rasheed, Deputy District Attorney alongwith Mr. Gul Rahman Assistant Commissioner for respondents present.

Learned counsel for the appellant requested for adjournment on the ground that he has not made preparation for arguments. Adjourned. To come up for arguments before the D.B on 15.02.2022.

  
(Atiq Ur Rehman Wazir)  
Member (E)




  
(Salah-ud-Din)  
Member (J)

Form- A

FORM OF ORDER SHEET

Court of \_\_\_\_\_

Case No.- 93571 /2020

S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1-	03/11/2020	<p>The appeal of Mr. Miraj-ud-Din resubmitted today by Syed Noman Ali Bukhar Advocate may be entered in the Institution Register and put up to the Worthy Chairman for proper order please.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> REGISTRAR</p>
2-	21.12.2020	<p>This case is entrusted to S. Bench for preliminary hearing to be put up there on <u>21/12/2020</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;"> CHAIRMAN</p> <p>Appellant present through counsel. Preliminary arguments heard. File perused.</p> <p>Points raised need consideration. Admitted to regular hearing subject to all legal objections. The appellant is directed to deposit security and process fee within 10 days. Thereafter, notices be issued to respondents for written reply/comments. To come up for written reply/comments on 15.03.2021 before S.B.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> (Rozina Rehman) Member (J)</p>

Appellant Deposited  
Security & Process Fee


  
21/12/20

The appeal received today, i.e. on 09-10-2020 is incomplete on the following scores, which is returned to the counsel for the appellant for completion and resubmission within 15 days.

- 1- Affidavit is not attached with appeal which may be placed on it.
- 2- Memorandum of the appeal may be got signed by the appellant.
- 3- Annex of appeal are not in sequence and flagged.

No. 2915 /S.T,

Dt. 12/10- /2020

  
REGISTRAR  
SERVICE TRIBUNAL  
KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA  
PESHAWAR.

Syed Noman Ali Shah, Adv.

SN,

objection removed a file re-submitted.  
myd  
for

**BEFORE THE KPK SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

453/13571  
APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_/2020

Miraj-Ud-Din

V/S

Revenue Deptt

-----  
**INDEX**

S.NO.	DOCUMENTS	ANNEXURE	PAGE
1.	Memo of Appeal	-----	1-4
2.	Copy of condonation of delay application	-----	05-06
3.	Copy of stay application	-----	07-08
4.	Copy of show cause	A	9
5.	copy of reply show cause	B	10
6.	Copy of high court judgment	C	11-14
7.	Copy of removal order	D	15
8.	Copy of departmental appeal	E	16-17
9.	Copy of appellate order	F	18-19
10.	Copy of impugned order	G	20
11.	Copy of departmental appeal	H	21-22
12.	Copy of rejection order	I	23
13.	vakalatnama	---	24

*Miraj-Ud-Din*  
APPELLANT  
Miraj-Ud-Din

THROUGH:

*Noman Ali Bukhari*  
SYED NOMAN ALI BUKHARI  
(ADVOCATE, HIGH COURT)

Cell No: 0306-5109438

**BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL**

**PESHAWAR**

13571

APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_/2020

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal

Diary No. 11384

Dated 09/10/2020

Mr Miraj-Ud-Din (Patwari) S/o Rahim Khan  
Deputy Commissioner Office Lakki Marwat.

(Appellant)

**VERSUS**

1. The SMBR Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar.
2. The Commissioner Bannu Division Bannu.
3. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat.

(Respondents)

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 13.08.2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED AND AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 24.8.2020 WHEREBY THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN RE-INSTATED IN TO SERVICE BY WITHHOLDING OF ONE ANNUAL INCREMENT FOR THE PERIOD OF TWO YEARS AND ALSO ORDER FOR RECOVERY AND AGAINST THE REJECTION ORDER DATED 17.09.2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT WAS REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUNDS.

**PRAYER:**

**Filed to-day**

Registrar  
09/11/2020

**Re-submitted to -day  
and filed.**

Registrar  
3/11/2020

THAT ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF THIS APPEAL, THE ORDER DATED 13.08.2020 AND 24.08.2020 MAY PLEASE BE MODIFIED TO THE EXTENT OF INCREMENT AND RECOVERY AND RESTORE THE ANNUAL INCREMENT FOR APPELLANT FROM DUE DATE WITH ALL BACK AND CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND THE RESPONDENT MAY BE DIRECTED TO STOP THE RECOVERY FROM APPELLANT. ANY OTHER REMEDY WHICH THIS TRIBUNAL FIT AND PROPER MAY ALSO BE AWARDED IN THE FAVOUR OF APPELLANT.

**RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:**

**FACTS:**

1. That the appellant was serving as Patwari in office of Deputy Commissioner Lucky Marwat and the appellant working with full zeal and zest to the entire satisfaction of his superiors.
2. That the appellant while performing his duties served with show cause notice by respondent no.3. As per content of show cause notice, spouse of the appellant shown recipient of BISP Cash Grant. which was properly replied by the appellant and denied the entire allegations and clear the entire Situation. **Copy of show cause notice and reply is attached as annexure-A & B.**
3. That thereafter appellant also challenge the vires of the show cause notice before the Hon'able Peshawar High court Bannu bench. The Hon'ble Court is kind enough to disposed off the writ petition vide judgment dated 28.04.2020 with direction to respondent that the opportunity of hearing should be provided to the appellant and proper inquiry should be conducted and the appellant should be treated according to law. **(Copy of high court judgment is attached as Annexure-C).**
4. That thereafter the appellant was removed from service vide order dated 24.04.2020 without providing personal hearing and conducting proper inquiry in violation of E&D rules 2011 and High Court Judgment. **Copy of removal order is attached as annexure-D.**
5. That the appellant being feeling aggrieved filed departmental appeal against the order dated 24.04.2020 before the respondent no.2. the respondent no.2 accepted the departmental appeal vide order dated 13.08.2020 and on acceptance of the departmental appeal the appellant has been re-instated in to service with all back and consequential benefits by withholding of one annual increment for two year and also order for recovery. **Copy of departmental appeal and appellate order dated 13.08.2020 is attached as annexure-E & F.**
6. That thereafter the respondent no.3 issued the fresh order dated 24.08.2020 whereby the minor penalty of "*withholding of one annual increment for two year*" was imposed upon the appellant and also order recovery. The appellant feeling being aggrieved from the order dated 24.08.2020 filed departmental appeal against the impugned order dated 24.08.2020. which was rejected vide order dated 17.09.2020. **(Copy of order, departmental appeal and rejection order is attached as Annexure-G, H& I).**



7. That now the appellant comes to this august Tribunal on the following grounds amongst others.


**GROUND:**

- A) That impugned order dated. 13.08.2020 and 24.08.2020 is against the law, facts, norms of justice and material on record. Therefore, not tenable and liable to be modified.
- B) That no formal inquiry was conducted despite the direction of High Court, no procedure was followed before the penalty was imposed upon the appellant which is against the law and rules.
- C) That the recipient was spouse of the appellant not appellant himself and the survey team of BISP recommended his spouse for the subject relief taking their financial condition into account without appellant's consent.
- D) That the BISP survey teams duly recommended the wife of the appellant for the financial assistance keeping in view their poverty and at that time there was no clarity whether the government servant may avail the grant or not, it is cleared from the commissioner order. So the impugned order is unlawful and against the natural justice.
- E) That the sufficient grounds of innocence of the appellant exist as per provision of supreme court judgment cited as NLR 2005 TD supreme Court Page 78" as no one punished for the fault of others. So the impugned order is illegal.
- F) That no proper procedure has been followed before the awarding the penalty, the whole proceedings were conducted in violation of law and rules. Thus, not tenable in the eye of the law.
- G) That the inquiry was dispensed with in violation of law and rules which is further cleared from the Hon'ble High Court Judgment and Commissioner order dated 13.08.2020. therefore, the appellant has been re-instated into service, further it is stated that the increment of the appellant was also stopped without any fault on the part of the appellant. Which is liable to be correct by this Hon'ble tribunal
- H) That grounds taken in show cause reply and charge sheet reply may also be considered integral part of the appeal.
- I) That the appellant seeks permission to advance others grounds and proofs at the time of hearing.

It is, therefore most humbly prayed that the appeal of the appellant may be accepted as prayed for.

  
**APPELLANT**  
Miraj-Ud-Din

THROUGH:

  
**SYED NOMAN ALI BUKHARI**  
(ADVOCATE, HIGH COURT)

**BEFORE THE KPK SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_/2020

Miraj-Ud-Din

V/S


Revenue Deptt

.....  
**APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION  
OF DELAY IN THE INSTANT APPEAL**


**RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:**

1. That the instant appeal is pending before this Honorable Tribunal in which no date has been fixed.
2. That if the tribunal determined that the impugned order 24.08.2020 is appellate order and no departmental appeal lie against the same. Then the increment and recovery is recurring cause of action being financial matter so there is no limitation run against the same, so the limitation may be condoned and if other wise then the appeal is well in time.
3. That according to Superior Court Judgment and this Hon'able tribunal Judgment, if the order is passed without following procedure the same has nullity in eye of law and treated to be void and there is no limitation run against the void order. So there is in interest of justice the limitation may be condoned.
4. That the august Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that decision on merit should be encouraged rather than knocking-out the litigants on technicalities including limitation. Therefore, appeal needs to be decided on merit (2003, PLD (SC) 724.
5. That, the appeal of the appellant on merit is good enough to be decided on merits.

It is therefore most humbly prayed that the instant appeal may be decided on merit by condoning the delay to meet the ends of justice.


  
APPELLANT  
Miraj-Ud-Din

THROUGH:

  
SYED NOMAN ALI BUKHARI  
Advocate, High Court.  
Peshawar

**AFFIDAVIT**

It is affirmed and declared that the contents application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from Hon'able tribunal.



  
DEPONENT

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

**APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_/2020**

Miraj-Ud-Din

V/S

Revenue Deptt

.....

**APPLICATION FOR SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF THE  
IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 24.08.2020 TO THE EXTENT OF  
RECOVERY AND RESTRAINING THE RESPONDENTS FROM  
MAKING RECOVERY FROM APPELLANT TILL THE FINAL  
DECISION OF THE MAIN APPEAL.**

**RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:**


1. That the appellant has filed an appeal along with this application in which a date is not fixed so far.
2. That the appellant filed above mentioned appeal against the order dated 24.08.2020.
3. That all the conduct of the respondents is based on malafide and against the cause of justice. More, so the appellant has a good prima facie case and all the ingredients are in favour of appellant. The grounds of the appeal consider integral part of the application.
4. That if the respondents are not restrained from making recovery then the appellant will suffer from irrespective loss.

It is, therefore, most humbly prayed that the order dated 24.08.2020 may be suspended to the extent of recovery and the respondent may be restrained from

making recovery from appellant till the final decision of the main Appeal. Any other remedy, which this august Tribunal deems fit and appropriate that, may also be awarded in favour of appellant.

  
Appellant  
Miraj-Ud-Din

THROUGH:

  
(SYED NOMAN ALI BUKHARI)  
ADVOCATE, HIGH COURT

**AFFIDAVIT:**

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



  
DEPONENT



OFFICE OF THE  
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

LAKKI MARWAT (KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA) Ph: # 0930-538330-31 Fax: # 0930-538336  
email: delakki.marwat@hotmail.com facebook: www.facebook.com/delakki.marwat website: www.lakki.marwat.gov.pk

A 9

No. 603 DC/LM/Estab:/F.12

Dated: 17/10/2020

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE

I, Abdul Haseeb Khan, Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat as Competent Authority, under Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Government Servant (Efficiency & Disciplinary) Rules, 2011 do hereby serve you, Mr. Miraj Ud Din Patwari (BPS-09) Deputy Commissioner office Lakki Marwat as follow

I am satisfied that you have committed the following acts /omission specified in rules-3 of the specified rules.

- a. That you being a Government Servant, your spouse were recipient of BISF Cash Grant meant for destitute.
  - b. By reasons of the above, you appear to be guilty of misconduct under rules 3 of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Government Servants (Efficiency and Discipline) Rules, 2011, and have rendered yourself liable to all-or any of the penalties specified in rules 4 of the rules ibid:
2. In terms of Rules-5 of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Government Servants (Efficiency and Discipline) Rules, 2011; I, as Competent Authority, dispense with the Inquiry and serve you with a show case notice under Rules-7 of the ibid rules.

3. As a result therefore, I, as competent authority, have tentatively decided to impose upon you the following penalty under rules-4 of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Government Servants (Efficiency and Discipline) Rules, 2011;

REMOVAL FROM SERVICES.

4. You are therefore, required to show cause as to why the aforesaid penalty should not be imposed upon you and also intimate whether you desire to be heard in person.
5. If no reply to this notice is received within Seven days or not more than fifteen days of its delivery, it shall be presumed that you have no defense to put in and; in that case, ex-parte action shall be taken against you.

(ABDUL HASEEB KHAN)  
Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat.

Miraj Ud Din  
Patwari BPS-09  
DC Office Lakki Marwat.

AE W/FO

To:- The Deputy Commissioner,  
Lakki Marwat.

Subject: REPLY TO SHOW CAUSE NOTICE

Respected Sir,

With reference to show cause notice bearing No. 603/DC/LM/Estab:/F.12 dated 17.04.2020 received on 20.04.2020, my reply to show cause notice is submitted as under:-

1. That I am the bonafide resident of Village Chuhar Khei Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
2. That I have been passed Patwar training in Karak 2010 while married in 2009. After training I have awaited for appointment and continued my private studies and passed my MA Islamiat in 2017.
3. That I was appointed as a Patwari on 31.03.2016 having completed about over 03 years of services and presently performing the duties as a Patwari as assistant in the office of District Kanungo Lakki Marwat
4. That I have been served with clean conduct upto now and has not given any chance of complaint and served under the entire satisfaction of my superiors.
5. That total 09 family members depend on my meager salary and hardly to pass these present hard days.
6. That now I have come to know that my spouse has drawn BISP Cash Grant but on enquiry I have come to know that during the course of survey conducted by the team of BISP before my marriage through local elders and my spouse CNIC was registered with them at her parents locality for which I have neither contacted nor I submitted any request for the same and this show cause notice is not based on facts/justice.
7. It is further pointed out that District Lakki Marwat is backward area of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and our family consists of about 09 family members totally depend upon my meager salary.
8. That settled law, justice and natural law demands that other family member, father of son or husband of spouse of an mistake could not be punished and is against the law/justice as provided in Supreme Court of Pakistan Judgement - 2005 PD (Supreme Court Page 78).

Sir, I am innocent, not aware regarding the facts and figures of the case and is liable to be exonerated from the charges leveled against me.


Keeping in view my above submissions, my long outstanding clean conduct and about over 03 years meritorious services, I request your kind honour that I may very kindly be exonerated from the charges and the show cause notice may kindly be filed without any further proceedings and oblige.

Sir, I reserve my rights of appeal as provided in Rule 22 of the Civil Servant Act, 1973.

Thanking You Sir,

Yours Most Obedient Servant.

Dated: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/2020




Miraj Ud Din  
Patwari District Kanungo Officer  
DC Office Lakki Marwat.

ATTACHED



BEFORE THE HON'BLE PESHAWAR HIGH COURT  
BANNU BENCH

Writ Petition # 418-B /2019



- (1) Humayun Khan S/O Imam Din R/O Muslim. Abad, Mohallah Machan Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (2) Sami Ullah Khan S/O Naimat Ullah Khan R/O Jhang Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (3) Bashir Nawaz S/O Sultan Khan R/O Bamozai Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (4) Noor Ali Khan S/O Habib Ullah Khan R/O Mohallah Khoicad Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (5) Hamd Ullah Jan S/O Hakim Khan R/O Mohallah Kara Khel, Nawar Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (6) Rehmat Ullah Khan S/O Muhammad Nawaz Khan R/O Ahmad Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (7) Sana Ullah Khan S/O Sikander Khan R/O Bachkin Ahmad zai Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (8) Naqib Ahmad S/O Rashid Ahmad R/O Landa Ahmad Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat.
- (9) Miraj - ud -Din S/O Rahim Khan R/O Jhang Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat. *Present*  
R/o House #394/A, Mohallah New Tanchi Bazaar Bannu City  
~~~~~ (PETITIONERS)

--- VERSUS ---

- (1) The Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Establishment and Administration Department (Regulation Wing Peshawar.
- (2) The Commissioner Bannu Division, Bannu.
- (3) The Deputy Commissioner, Lakki Marwat.
- (4) The Incharge Benazir Income Support Program, Lakki Marwat.

~~~~~ (RESPONDENTS)

Filed Today

23 APR 2020

*Sultan*

**ATTENDED**

**ATTESTED**  
EXAMINER  
Peshawar High Court  
Bannu Bench

(12)

PESHAWAR HIGH COURT,  
BANNU BENCH.

FORM 'A'

FORM OF ORDER SHEET

| Date of order or proceedings<br>(1) | Order or other proceedings with signature of Judge (s).<br>(2)  |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 28-04-2020                          | <p><u>W.P No.418-B of 2020.</u></p> <p>Present:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Akbarullah Khan Wazir advocate for petitioners.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p><u>SAHIBZADA ASADULLAH J.</u>--- Through the instant Writ petition, filed under Article 199 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, petitioners Humayun Khan and others have challenged the wires of Show Cause Notice under section 5 (3) of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Police rules, 1975, issued by respondent No.5 in pursuance of letter # SOP-1 ( E &amp; AD) 4-17/2020 dated 14/02/2020 of respondent No.1, as illegal, based on malafide intention, against the facts, <i>void ab initio.</i></p> <p>2- Short but relevant facts of the instant</p> |

ATTESTED  
CLERK  
Peshawar High Court  
Bannu Bench

ATTESTED

Writ Petition are that petitioners were performing their duties in FRP Police; that their spouses were receiving cash from Benazir Income Support Program (BISP) and the petitioners being government Servants are not entitled to derive benefit from said program which is against the Standing Operating Procedure (SOP) of the BISP. In this respect, Show Cause Notice was issued by the respondent No.5 to the petitioners in pursuance of letter # SOP-1 ( E & AD) 4-17/2020 dated 14/02/2020 of respondent No.1, hence the instant Writ Petition.

3- The contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that petitioners were performing their duties in FRP Police but they were having no knowledge of submitting such applications by their spouses and that most of spouses are illiterate and they were unaware of the consequences of deriving such benefits from Benazir Income Support Program (BISP) cash grant.

4- Admittedly the respondent No.5 has issued Show cause notices to the petitioners for getting benefit from the BISP of their wives which is against the SOP. No adverse action has been taken against the petitioners hence the case is at pre mature stage. On

ATTESTED  
 High Court  
 Bench

ATTESTED

the mere facts of apprehension that the petitioners would not be treated in accordance with law, the Writ Petition could not lie.

5- In view of the above, this Writ Petition is disposed of with the direction that after providing them the opportunity of hearing and conducting proper inquiry the petitioners should be treated in accordance with law, rules and policy. Order accordingly.

Sd/- Justice Ms. Musarrat Hilali, J  
Sd/- Mr. Justice Sahibzada Asadullah, J

Announced.  
28-04-2020

*[Handwritten signature]*  
30/4/20



CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

*[Handwritten signature]*  
30-4-2020

Examiner  
Peshawar High Court Baran Bench  
Authorised Under Article 67 of  
The Qanun-e-Shahadat Ordinance 1984

**ATTESTED**



OFFICE OF THE  
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

LAKKI MARWAT (KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA) PH# 0969-538330-31 Fax# 538333  
email: dc.lakki@kpk.gov.pk facebook: www.facebook.com/dcl.lakki.marwat website: www.lakki.marwat.kpk.gov.pk

No. 1120 /DC/LM/Estab:

Dated: 24/04/2020

OFFICE ORDER

My this order will dispose off the Departmental proceedings initiated against Mr. Miraj-ud-Din Patwari (BPS-09) Deputy Commissioner Office Lakki Marwat who was found to indulge in the following alligations:

1. That he being a Government Servant, his spouse was recipient of BISP Cash Grant for destitute.
2. Such act on his part is prejudicial to good order / service of discipline.

He was issued show cause notice to this effect. His explanation to the Show Cause Notice was not received by this office.

Therefore, I, Abdul Haseeb Khan, Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat exercise of the power vested upon me under Rules -4 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Government Servants (Efficiency & Discipline) Rules, 2011, hereby impose upon him major punishment of "REMOVAL FROM SERVICE" with immediate effect.

(ABDUL HASEEB KHAN)  
Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat

Even No & Date.

Copy forwarded to the:

1. Commissioner Bannu Division Bannu for information with referenece to his letter No. 1390/F.B.IS.P(LM) dated 06.03.2020
2. Additional Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat
3. Official concerned.

Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat

**ATTENDED**

it has been transpired that the BISP survey teams duly recommended the wife of the appellatant for the financial assistance keeping in view their

BEFORE THE COURT OF COMMISSIONER, BANNU DIVISION

DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL NO \_\_\_\_\_

Miraj Ud Din S/O Rahim Khan R/O Village Chuhar Khel District Lakki Marwat Ex Patwari Deputy Commissioner Office Lakki Marwat. ....Appellant

Versus

The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat ..... Respondent

DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL/REPRESENTATION UNDER RULE 4 OF THE SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE IMPUGNED ORDER NO. 1120 DATED 24.04.2020 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT VIDE WHICH APPELLANT HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE AGAINST RULES/POLICY.

Respectfully Sheweth:-

The appellant being aggrieved from the order dated 24.04.2020 passed by Respondent, hereby submit departmental appeal/representation as provided in Rule 4 of Service Tribunal Act, 1974, as under:-

FACTS:-

1. That the appellant has been served in the Respondent Department as a Patwari since 31.03.2016 having completed about 04 years of meritorious services.
2. That the appellant has served to the entire satisfaction of his superiors officers upto now.
3. That a Show Cause Notice was served by respondent upon the appellant vide letter No. 603 dated 17.04.2020 handed over on 20.04.2020, given 7-15 days for reply (Photocopy attached as Annexure A).
4. That as per content of show cause notice, spouse of the appellant shown recipient of BISP Cash Grant.
5. That the respondent dispensed with the inquiry in violation of rules and no opportunity of personal hearing given as provided in Rule 7 (d) of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Government Servants (Efficiency and Discipline) Rules, 2011.
6. That the respondent passed the impugned order before submission of reply to show cause notice by the appellant nor any personal hearing opportunity given in violation of Rule 7 (b) and (d).

**ATTESTED**

7. That the respondent order is illegal, malafide and in violation of Supreme Court of Pakistan Judgement published vide 2005 PD Supreme Court Page 78) as no one shall be punished on the fault of the other.
8. However, the appellant also filed a Writ Petition No. 418-B in Peshawar High Court Bench Bannu on 22.04.2020 and the court passed the order on 28.04.2020 which is as under (Photocopy enclosed as Annexure B:-
- "Writ Petition is disposed off with the direction that after providing them the opportunity of hearing and conducting proper inquiry the petitioner should be treated in accordance with law, rules and policy"
9. The appellant is aggrieved from the order passed by the respondent in violation of natural as well as settled law, hence the instant appeal on the following grounds:-

GROUND:-

- A. That the appellant is served as a Patwari for a long period with clean conduct.
- B. That the employee is a low paid government servant having large number of dependents.
- C. That the BISP Cash Grant has not been drawn by the appellant but drawn by souse of the appellant through a proper survey conducted by the team of BISP with no intention of the appellant.
- D. That the employees of other departments alleged grant of BISP have been allowed in service and recovery in installment is to be made.
- E. That sufficient grounds of innocence of the appellant exist as per provision of Supreme Court of Pakistan Judgement quoted in (2005 PD Supreme Court Page 78).
- F. However, the allegation leveled against the appellant if proved, the spouse of the appellant will refund the amount of the grant.
- It is, therefore, prayed that on acceptance of the above grounds, the impugned order No. 1120 Dated 24.04.2020 passed by the respondent, may kindly be set aside and the appellant may be re-instated into government served with all back benefits.

(MIRAJ UD DIN EX PATWARI)  
APPELLANT

ATTESTED

IN THE COURT OF COMMISSIONER BANNU DIVISION

BANNU

Mr. Miraj ud din Ex-Patwar, Office of DC, Lakki Marwat (Appellant)

Versus

Deputy Commissioner, Lakki Marwat (Respondent)

ORDER:

Mr. Miraj ud din Ex-Patwar of the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Lakki Marwat has moved an appeal against the impugned order No. 1120/DC/LM/Estab, dated 24/04/2020 issued by the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat, the respondent department herein, whereby the appellant has been removed from service.

Brief history of the case is that Establishment Department Khyber Pakhtunkhwa asked all the departments to take action against all those government servants whose family members were the recipient of cash grant from BISP. Pursuant to the directions, the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat issued a show-cause notice to the respondent. The respondent denied the impugned order. Hence the major penalty of removal from service with the impugned order. Hence the instant appeal was filed.

Aggrieved from which the appellant preferred an appeal against the impugned order of Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat taking the plea that in the instant case his spouse was recipient of the BISP grant, not him. The survey team of BISP recommended his spouse for the subject relief taking their financial condition into account without his consent. Similarly the respondent department did not conduct formal inquiry before issuance of the impugned order which is a pre-requisite under the E&D Rules - 2011.

Parties present and heard in detail.

Mr. Amin Ullah Additional Assistant Commissioner-II, Lakki Marwat is present on behalf of the Deputy Commissioner, Lakki Marwat.

Perusal of the record as well as defense offered by the appellant. It has been transpired that the BISP survey teams duly recommended the wife of the appellant for the financial assistance keeping in view their

ATTACHED


Attested  
Reader to Commissioner  
Bannu Division  
4/1/2020

19 F




poverty. At that time there was no clarity whether the government servant may avail the grant or not.

For what has been observed, and stated above the impugned order of the Deputy Commissioner, Lakki Marwat is set aside. The appellant is re-instated in service with all back benefits with retrospective effect by with-holding of one (01) annual increment for the period of two years only. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat will ensure recovery of the total amount, received from BISP by the family members of the appellant, from him in the monthly installments equal to the amount received from BISP per month after confirmation from the BISP office Lakki Marwat.

  
COMMISSIONER,  
BANNU DIVISION

Announced  
13/08/2020

  
Reader to Commissioner  
Bannu Division

19/08/2020

ATTEMPTED

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

LAKKI MARWAT (KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA) Ph: # 0969-538330-31 Fax: # 0969-538333  
email: dclakki@paf.gov.pk Facebook: www.facebook.com/dclakki@paf.gov.pk Website: www.lakki@paf.gov.pk

No. 1821 DC/LM/Estab:/2020/F.12

Dated: 24 / 08 / 2020

OFFICE ORDER

In compliance with the orders of worthy Commissioner Bannu Division Bannu dated 13.08.2020, conveyed through his letter No. 2540/Reader dated 19.08.2020, Mr. Miraj ud Din Patwari (BPS-09) Deputy Commissioner Office Lakki Marwat is hereby reinstated into Government service with all back benefits with retrospective effect by with-holding of one (01) annual increment for the period of two years.

NOTE: Assistant Director BISP Lakki Marwat is directed to provide total amount received from BISP by the Family member of Mr. Miraj ud Din Patwari (BPS-09), to start monthly installment equal to the amount received from BISP per month.

Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat.

Even No & Date.

Copy forwarded to the:

1. Commissioner Bannu Division Bannu for information with reference to above.
2. Additional Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat
3. Assistant Commissioner Lakki Marwat.
4. Assistant Director BISP Lakki Marwat with the directions to provide the detail in respect of above official.
5. Official concerned.

Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat.

**ATTESTED**

it has been transpired that the BISP survey teams duly recommended the wife of the appellant for the financial assistance keeping in view their

H (21)

BEFORE THE SENIOR MEMBER, BOARD OF REVENUE,  
KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA PESHAWAR

(Departmental Appellate Authority)

ISMBR  
1108  
09/09/20

DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL NO \_\_\_\_\_

As (Estt)  
Sey  
9-9-20

Miraj Ud Din S/O Rahim Khan Patwari Deputy Commissioner Office Lakki Marwat. Appellant

Versus

1. The Commissioner Bannu Division Bannu. )
2. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat ) Respondents

MRP

DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL/REPRESENTATION UNDER RULE 4 OF THE SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 13.08.2020 PASSED BY RESPONDENT NO. 1 VIDE WHICH PENALTY IMPOSED BY APPELLANT BY WITHHOLDING OF ONE ANNUAL INCREMEENT FOR THE PERIOD OF TWO YEARS AND RECOVERY OF TOTAL AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM BISP BY THE FAMILY MEMBERS OF THE APPELLANT IN MONTHLY INSTALEMENTS EQUAL TO THE AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM BISP AND IMPLEMENTED BY RESPONDENT NO. 2 VIDE OFFICE ORDER NO. 1821/DC/LM/ESTAB:/2020/F.12 DATED 24.08.2020.

Respectfully Sheweth:-

The appellant being aggrieved from the order dated 13.08.2020 passed by Respondent No. 1 and order dated 24.08.2020 passed by respondent no. 2, hereby submit departmental appeal/ representation as provided in Rule 4 of Service Tribunal Act, 1974, as under:-

FACTS:-

Sey  
Oh  
MRB-III  
02/09/2020  
9/9/20

1. That the appellant is the bonafide resident of Village Jhang Khel Tehsil and District Lakki Marwat and has been served/serving as Patwari having been completed about 04 years of meritorious services.
2. That the appellant has served/serving to the entire satisfaction of his superior's officer's uptil now.
3. That a Show Cause Notice was served by respondent upon the appellant vide letter No. 603 dated 17.04.2020 by respondent No. 2 handed over on 20.04.2020, given 7-15 days time limit for reply. (Photocopy attached as Annexure A).
4. That as per content of show cause notice, spouse of the appellant shown recipient of BISP Cash Grant.
5. That the respondent dispensed with the inquiry in violation of rules and no opportunity of personal hearing given as provided in Rule 7 ( d) of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Government Servants (Efficiency and Discipline) Rules, 2011.
6. That the respondent No. 2 removed the appellant from service on 24.04.2020 before submission of reply to show cause notice by the appellant nor any personal hearing opportunity given as provided in Rule 7 (b) and (d) on (Annexure B)
7. That aggrieved from the orders dated 24.04.2020 passed by respondent No. 2, the appellant preferred a departmental appeal before the respondent No. 1 and after hearing imposed two penalties upon the appellant by:-

P/2

ATTENDED

- a. Withhold of one annual increment for a period of two years.
  - b. Recovery of all cash grant received by wife of the appellant from BISP.
8. That the appellant further aggrieved from the orders dated 13.08.2020 conveyed vide letter No. 2540/Reader dated 19.08.2020 (Annexure C), hereby submit a departmental appeal/representation on the following grounds:-

GROUNDS

- A. That the appellant has been served/serving as a Patwari for a long period with clean conduct.
- B. That the appellant is a low paid government servant having large number of dependents.
- C. That the BISP Cash Grant has not been drawn by the appellant but alleged drawn by souse of the appellant through a proper survey conducted by the team of BISP with no intention of the appellant nor known.
- D. That the employees of other department's alleged grant of BISP have been re-instated into government service with only recovery of BISP Cash Grant in monthly installments.
- E. That sufficient grounds of innocence of the appellant exist as per provision of Supreme Court of Pakistan Judgement quoted in (NLR 2005 TD Supreme Court Page 78).
- F. That the orders of respondents are illegal, malafide and in violation of Supreme Court of Pakistan Judgement published vide NLR 2005 TD Supreme Court Page 78) as no one shall be punished on the fault of the other.
- G. That the appellant also filed a Writ Petition No. 418-B in Peshawar High Court Bench Bannu on 22,04.2020 and the court passed the order on 28.04.2020 which is as under (Photocopy enclosed as Annexure D:-

"Writ Petition is disposed off with the direction that after providing them the opportunity of hearing and conducting proper inquiry the petitioner should be treated in accordance with law, rules and policy" but respondent no. 2 has neither conducted any enquiry nor any opportunity of personal hearing given.

- H. That the appellant is further aggrieved from the orders of the respondent No. 1 and 2 on account of withholding of one annual increment and recovery of all amount drawn by the spouse of the appellant from BISP Cash Grant which is against the Supreme Court judgement quoted above.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that on acceptance of the instant appeal, the impugned order dated 13.08.2020 passed by respondent No. 1 and order No. 1821 Dated 24.08.2020 passed by the respondent No. 2 may kindly be set aside and the annual increment of the appellant may be restored and recovery may not be made from the appellant.

**ATTESTED**

*(Handwritten Signature)*  
 (MIRAJ UD DIN PATWARI)  
 APPELLANT

I (23)



GOVERNMENT OF KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA,  
BOARD OF REVENUE,  
REVENUE & ESTATE DEPARTMENT.

No. Estt:VII/Departmental Appeals/24215


Peshawar dated the 17/09/2020.

To

Mr. Miraj-Ud-Din,  
Patwari office of the  
Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat.

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL / REPRESENTATION.

Your Departmental Appeal has been examined in light of Appeal Rules 1986 and filed by the Competent Authority as you have already availed the chance of appeal before the Commissioner Bannu Division. Therefore, you are directed to approach the proper forum for the purpose please.

  
Assistant Secretary (Estt.)

alc

**ATTACHED**

بعدالت

KP Service Tribunal Petition

2 منجانب  
بنام

Mirza J. Akbar

بنام

در

Revenue

مورخہ

مقدمہ

دعویٰ

جرم

### باعث تحریر آنکہ

مقدمہ مندرجہ عنوان بالا میں اپنی طرف سے واسطے پیروی صاحب دعویٰ وکیل کاروائی متعلقہ

آن مقام میاں کیلئے مسٹر مسلمان علی خاں

مقرر کر کے اقرار کیا جاتا ہے۔ کہ صاحب موصوف کو مقدمہ کی کل کاروائی کا کامل اختیار ہوگا۔ نیز وکیل صاحب کو راضی نامہ کرنے و تقرر ثالث و فیصلہ پر خلف دیئے جواب دہی اور اقبال دعویٰ اور بصورت ڈگری کرنے اجراء اور وصولی چیک و روپیہ ارضی دعویٰ اور درخواست ہر قسم کی تصدیق و زرائیں پر دستخط کرانے کا اختیار ہوگا۔ نیز صورت عدم پیروی یا ڈگری یکطرفہ یا اپیل کی برابری اور منسوخی نیز دائر کرنے اپیل ٹکرانی و نظر ثانی و پیروی کرنے کا مختار ہوگا۔ از بصورت ضرورت مقدمہ مذکور کے کل یا جزوی کاروائی کے واسطے اور وکیل یا مختار قانونی کو اپنے ہمراہ یا اپنے بجائے تقرر کا اختیار ہوگا۔ اور صاحب مقرر شدہ کو بھی وہی جملہ مذکورہ باختیارات حاصل ہوں گے اور اس کا ساختہ پر داختم منظور و قبول ہوگا دوران مقدمہ میں جو خرچہ ہر جانبہ التوائے مقدمہ کے سبب سے وہ ہوگا۔ کوئی تاریخ پیشی مقام دورہ پر ہو یا حد سے باہر ہو تو وکیل صاحب پابند ہوں گے۔ کہ پیروی مذکور کریں۔ لہذا وکالت نامہ لکھد یا کہ سندر ہے۔

20

ماہ

المرقوم

Hand  
of  
M. A. Akbar

Hand  
of  
M. A. Akbar

الع  
مقام  
الع  
دگ  
الع  
راہ  
الع  
کے لئے منظور ہے۔

**BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR****Appeal No. 13571/2020**

Maraj-ud-Din (Patwari) office of the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

**(Appellant)**

Versus

1. The Senior Member Board of Revenue KP Peshawar
2. The Commissioner Bannu Division
3. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

**(Respondents)****JOINT PARA-WISE REPLY/COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENTS:**Respectfully Sheweth:RESPONDENTS SUBMITTED AS UNDER:PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS:

1. The Appeal in hand is badly time barred.
2. The appellant has no cause of action and locus standi to bring the present appeal.
3. The appeal is barred by law and not maintainable in the present form.
4. The appeal is bad for mis-joinder and non-joinder of necessary and proper parties.
5. The appellant is estopped by his own conduct.
6. That this August Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the matter.

REPLY ON FACTS


1. Correct only to the extent that the appellant is permanent government servant in this office and working as Patwari.
2. In reply to Para-2, it is submitted that show cause dated 17-04-2020 (Annexure-A) was correctly served to the appellant as his spouse was recipient of BISP cash grant.
3. Pertains to record.
4. In reply it is submitted that the Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Establishment and Administration Department Peshawar letter bearing No.SOR-I (E&AD)4-17/2020 dated 14-02-2020 (Annexure-B) circulated through Commissioner Bannu Division, a list of officers/official, who either themselves or their spouses were receiving BISP cash grant. In this context the competent authority has therefore, decided to issue direct Show Cause Notices upon the accused civil servants as provided in Rule-7 of the Rules ibid dispensing with the formal inquiry.
5. Respondent No.2 being competent authority, rightly issued order dated 13-08-2020 (Annexure-C), in accordance with Law/Rules.
6. Correct to the extent that appellant had lodged 2<sup>nd</sup> departmental appeal before the Senior Member Board of Revenue Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar, but the appeal was filed vide order dated 24-08-2020 (Annexure-D), that since the appellant has once availed the chance of departmental appeal before the Commissioner Bannu Division, because there is no provision of filing 2<sup>nd</sup> department appeal in the service law.
7. That the instant service appeal is baseless and barred by law.

**REPLY ON GROUNDS:**


- a. Incorrect, both the orders are based on fact/law and issued after all codal formalities.
- b. The guilt was very clear as the appellant or his wife was receiving BISP fund, as such in pursuance of Govt. instructions, a direct Show Cause Notice was issued under Rule-7 of KPK Government Servant E&D Rules-2011. Detail reply is given in Para-4 ibid.
- c. Detail reply already given in paras ibid.
- d. Pertains to record and subject to proof.
- e. The penalty imposed over the appellant is in according with law and rules. The referred judgment of August Supreme Court of Pakistan is not applicable to the appellant case, as he is depositing illegally received BISP grant (Annexure-E). Detail reply already given above.
- f. Incorrect. Already explained above.
- g. As explained paras ibid.
- h. The instant appeal is not maintainable. Proper preliminary objections have been raised.
- i. That other grounds shall be explained during the arguments with permission of Hon'ble Tribunal.

It is therefore, most humbly prayed that this appeal may be dismissed with


cost.



Commissioner Bannu Division  
Respondent No.2



Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat  
Respondent No.3



Senior Member Board of Revenue  
Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Respondent No.1



BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Appeal No. 13571/2020

Maraj-ud-Din (Patwari) office of the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Appellant)

Versus

- 1. The Senior Member Board of Revenue KP Peshawar
- 2. The Commissioner Bannu Division
- 3. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Respondents)

\*\*\*\*\*

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 13-08-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED AND AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 24-08-2020 WHEREBY THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN RE-INSTATED IN TO SERVICE BY WITHOLDING OF ONE ANNUAL INCREMENT FOR THE PERIOD OF TWO YEARS AND ALSO ORDER FOR RECOVERY AND AGAINST THE REJECTION ORDER DATED 17-09-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT WAS REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUNDS.

AUTHORITY

Muhammad Sajjad Litigation Officer of this office is hereby authorized to submit parawise comments on behalf of Respondent No.1, 2, and 3, to defend the case titled above, till it is decided.

Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat



④

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Appeal No. 13571/2020

Maraj-ud-Din (Patwari) office of the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Appellant)

Versus

1. The Senior Member Board of Revenue KP Peshawar
2. The Commissioner Bannu Division
3. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat


(Respondents)

\*\*\*\*\*

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 13-08-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED AND AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 24-08-2020 WHEREBY THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN RE-INSTATED IN TO SERVICE BY WITHOLDING OF ONE ANNUAL INCREMENT FOR THE PERIOD OF TWO YEARS AND ALSO ORDER FOR RECOVERY AND AGAINST THE REJECTION ORDER DATED 17-09-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT WAS REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUNDS.

AFFIDAVIT

Muhammad Sajjad Litigation Officer of this office do hereby solemnly affirm and declare that all the contents of these parawise comments are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Honorable Court.

  
Deponents

**LITIGATION OFFICER**  
Deputy Commissioner  
Office Lakki Marwat

①

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Appeal No. 13571/2020

Maraj-ud-Din (Patwari) office of the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Appellant)

Versus

1. The Senior Member Board of Revenue KP Peshawar
2. The Commissioner Bannu Division
3. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Respondents)

JOINT PARA-WISE REPLY/COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENTS:

Respectfully Sheweth:

RESPONDENTS SUBMITTED AS UNDER:

PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS:

1. The Appeal in hand is badly time barred.
2. The appellant has no cause of action and locus standi to bring the present appeal.
3. The appeal is barred by law and not maintainable in the present form.
4. The appeal is bad for mis-joinder and non-joinder of necessary and proper parties.
5. The appellant is estopped by his own conduct.
6. That this August Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the matter.

REPLY ON FACTS


1. Correct only to the extent that the appellant is permanent government servant in this office and working as Patwari.
2. In reply to Para-2, it is submitted that show cause dated 17-04-2020 (Annexure-A) was correctly served to the appellant as his spouse was recipient of BISP cash grant.
3. Pertains to record.
4. In reply it is submitted that the Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Establishment and Administration Department Peshawar letter bearing No.SOR-I (E&AD)4-17/2020 dated 14-02-2020 (Annexure-B) circulated through Commissioner Bannu Division, a list of officers/official, who either themselves or their spouses were receiving BISP cash grant. In this context the competent authority has therefore, decided to issue direct Show Cause Notices upon the accused civil servants as provided in Rule-7 of the Rules ibid dispensing with the formal inquiry.
5. Respondent No.2 being competent authority, rightly issued order dated 13-08-2020 (Annexure-C), in accordance with Law/Rules.
6. Correct to the extent that appellant had lodged 2<sup>nd</sup> departmental appeal before the Senior Member Board of Revenue Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar, but the appeal was filed vide order dated 24-08-2020 (Annexure-D), that since the appellant has once availed the chance of departmental appeal before the Commissioner Bannu Division, because there is no provision of filling 2<sup>nd</sup> department appeal in the service law.
7. That the instant service appeal is baseless and barred by law.

REPLY ON GROUNDS:

- a. Incorrect, both the orders are based on fact/law and issued after all codal formalities.
- b. The guilt was very clear as the appellant or his wife was receiving BISP fund, as such in pursuance of Govt. instructions, a direct Show Cause Notice was issued under Rule-7 of KPK Government Servant E&D Rules-2011. Detail reply is given in Para-4 ibid.
- c. Detail reply already given in paras ibid.
- d. Pertains to record and subject to proof.
- e. The penalty imposed over the appellant is in according with law and rules. The referred judgment of August Supreme Court of Pakistan is not applicable to the appellant case, as he is depositing illegally received BISP grant (Annexure-E). Detail reply already given above.
- f. Incorrect: Already explained above.
- g. As explained paras ibid.
- h. The instant appeal is not maintainable. Proper preliminary objections have been raised.
- i. That other grounds shall be explained during the arguments with permission of Hon'ble Tribunal.

It is therefore, most humbly prayed that this appeal may be dismissed with


cost.



Commissioner Bannu Division  
Respondent No.2



Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat  
Respondent No.3



Senior Member Board of Revenue  
Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Respondent No.1

3

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Appeal No. 13571/2020

Maraj-ud-Din (Patwari) office of the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Appellant)

Versus

1. The Senior Member Board of Revenue KP Peshawar
2. The Commissioner Bannu Division
3. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Respondents)

\*\*\*\*\*

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 13-08-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED AND AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 24-08-2020 WHEREBY THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN RE-INSTATED IN TO SERVICE BY WITHOLDING OF ONE ANNUAL INCREMENT FOR THE PERIOD OF TWO YEARS AND ALSO ORDER FOR RECOVERY AND AGAINST THE REJECTION ORDER DATED 17-09-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT WAS REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUNDS.

AUTHORITY

Muhammad Sajjad Litigation Officer of this office is hereby authorized to submit parawise comments on behalf of Respondent No.1, 2, and 3, to defend the case titled above, till it is decided.

Deputy Commissioner  
Lakki Marwat



4

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Appeal No. 13571/2020

Maraj-ud-Din (Patwari) office of the Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Appellant)

Versus

1. The Senior Member Board of Revenue KP Peshawar
2. The Commissioner Bannu Division
3. The Deputy Commissioner Lakki Marwat

(Respondents)

\*\*\*\*\*

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 13-08-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED AND AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 24-08-2020 WHEREBY THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN RE-INSTATED IN TO SERVICE BY WITHHOLDING OF ONE ANNUAL INCREMENT FOR THE PERIOD OF TWO YEARS AND ALSO ORDER FOR RECOVERY AND AGAINST THE REJECTION ORDER DATED 17-09-2020 WHEREBY THE DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL OF THE APPELLANT WAS REJECTED FOR NO GOOD GROUNDS.

AFFIDAVIT

Muhammad Sajjad Litigation Officer of this office do hereby solemnly affirm and declare that all the contents of these parawise comments are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Honorable Court.



Deponents

**LITIGATION OFFICER**  
Deputy Commission  
Office Lakki Marwat