FORMOF ORDERSHEET

in agreed to be the second

	· · ·	Court of			
•	:		Misc. application No. 347/2023		
۰,	S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge		
•	1	2	3		
	. 1	30/05/2023	The Misc. application in appeal no. 78/2019		
			submitted today by Mr. Mufariq Shah Advocate. It is fixe for hearing before Single Bench. at Peshawar o		
•			for hearing before Single Bench at Peshawar o <u>のーのもーマのンラ</u> . Original file be requisitioned.		
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			A m.		
• .		· .	* REGISTRAR		
		~	•		
		· ·			
	-	· ·			
·					
•		÷			
		·			
		۱			
		,			

Before the Khyber Pukhtun	nkhwa, Services Tribunal, Pesh	awar
CM No. <u>347</u> /2023		
In Re;	Annual of the second	Kayber Pakhtakhwa Service Tribunal
Service Appeal No. 78/2019	SCANNED KPST Posilawar	Diary No. 560 Dated 20 5 2023
Ghulam Hussain	Appellant	5
VERSUS		*
Govt. of KPK	Responde	inte

Application for Rectification of the Judgment rendered in Service Appeal no. 78/2019, instituted on dated 17-01-2019, Decided on dated 13-12-2022, to the extent of mentioning the correct name of the Advocate/Counsel i.e. Mr. Mufariq Shah Advocate instead of Ibrahim Khan Afridi Advocate.

Respectfully Sheweth,

Place before the bench along case file



- That the above mentioned titled appeal was decided on dated 13-12-2022 by this worthy service tribunal.
- 2. That when the judgment was taken to the department to act upon as per the judgment, the department at once pointed out, that the case had been submitted and argued by Mr. Mufariq Shah Advocate but the name of the advocate had been wrongly mentined/typed as Mr. Ibrahim Khan Afridi Advocate which is the legal counsel of the LRH, hence this application for the rectification of the counsel/advocate name in the judgment dated 13-12-2022. (Copy of judgment in service appeal no. 78/2019 dated 13-12-2022 is annexed)

50/05/23

3. That there is no legal bar in allowing this application, rather it is in the best interest of justice.

It is therefore, humbly prayed that by allowing and accepting this application, the name mentioned wrongly as *Mr. Ibrahim Khan Afridi Advocate* may kindly be replaced with *Mr. Mufariq Shah Advocate*.

Applicant/Appellant

Through

Mufariq Shah Advocate High Court. Office No. 15, Hazrat Shah Plaza, Shoba Bazar, Peshawar. Mobile: 0314-9175656. Email:mufariq_shah@hotmail.com

Certificate/Affidavit;

It is certified that as per instruction imparted upon me by my client, no such like application has earlier been moved before this or any other court. Nothing concealed nor stated false anything from this worthy Tribunal.



Deponent

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Service Appeal No.78/2019

Date of Institution17.01.2019Date of Decision13.12.2022

Ghulam Hussain S/O Ghulam Sarwar R/O Presently Dalazak Road, Street No.

4, Mohalla Gul Abad No.1, Peshawar. 👘

(Appellant)

akhtun

VERSUS

E. Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Secretary Health Department, Peshawar.

2. Lady Reading Hospital Peshawar through its Director Hospital.

3. Director General Health Services Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.

(Respondents)

Ibrahim Khan Afridi Advocate

Naseer Ud Din Shah Assistant Advocate General

> Mrs. Rozina Rehman Miss Farceha Paul

Member (J) Member (E)

For appellant

For respondents

JUDGMENT

<u>ROZINA REHMAN, MEMBER (J)</u>: The appellant has invoked the jurisdiction of this Tribunal through above titled appeal with the prayer as copied below:

Qui ?

"That on acceptance of this appeal the impugned order dated 19.02.2018 may please be set aside/turned down and the deducted salary of the appellant may kindly be

reimbursed back to the appellant."



2. Brief facts of the case are that appellant was Provincial Civil Servant who was performing his duties in Leady Reading Hospital Peshawar as a cook. His salary was withheld without any reason and plausible explanation which was later on released vide order dated 19.02.2018. Respondents deducted salary of 71 days which is evident from his pay roll. He then submitted an application/departmental appeal regarding deduction of his salary but the same was not responded to; hence the present service appeal.

3. We have heard Ibrahim Khan Afridi, Advocate learned counsel for the appellant and Nascer Ud Din Shah learned Assistant Advocate General for respondents and have gone through the record and the proceedings of the case in minute particulars.

4. Ibrahim Khan Afridi, Advocate learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the impugned order is against law and facts as the appellant was not treated according to law rather treated in a discriminatory manner which was not warranted in the eyes of law. He submitted that the appellant was not treated at par with his colleagues as envisaged in article 4 of Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan. That as per Article 25 of Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan there shall be no discrimination but in the instant case whole process was done partially according to the will of the respondent No. 2. Learned counsel further contended that well settled principle of law "Audi alteram partem" was violated and that appellant was not given an opportunity before issuance of impugned order. He, therefore, requested

for acceptance of the instant service appeal.



5. Conversely, learned Assistant Advocate General submitted that the salary of the appellant was withheld due to non-performance of his duty. He submitted that appellant was transferred to the office of Assistant Director (Legal) vide office order dated 09.10.2017 but he failed to join his duty, therefore, explanation was called but no response was tendered, therefore, show cause notice was issued for his long absence on 15.01.2018 but he failed to submit any reply. He resumed his duty on 10.01.2018. In consequence respondent No. 2 issued letter dated 20.02.2018 vide which salary for period of absence from duty i.e 71 days, was ordered to be deducted. Lastly, he submitted that there was no discrimination and that appellant was treated in accordance with law and procedure.

6. From the record it is evident that the appellant was provincial eivil servant who was performing his duties in Leady Reading Hospital Peshawar as ward orderly. Allegations against the present appellant are that he remained absent for 71 days, therefore, salary for the said period was ordered to be deducted. Record shows that respondents blatantly violated the set norms and rules and conducted the proceedings in an authoritarian manner. No proper procedure as envisaged in E&D Rules, 2011 was followed. No charge sheet alongwith statement of allegations was issued to the appellant. No proper inquiry was conducted in order to bring on record the alleged absence of the appellant without the permission of the competent authority. It is astonishing as to why the department kept mum for a long period of 71 days without initiating proper proceedings against

ESTED

the appellant. Absence for 71 days was not proved through cogent evidence. The appellant was discriminated which is evident from the record that one Muhammad Waris, ward orderly was also charged for 43 days of absence and his salary was accordingly deducted. Reportedly he filed service appeal which was later on withdrawn because his salary for the said period was refunded vide office order dated 18.01.2019. No cogent reason was shown as to why was the appellant discriminated and his salary was not refunded.

A Contraction of the Contraction

7. For the above mentioned facts and circumstances, this appeal is allowed as prayed for. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to the record room.

ANNOUNCED 13.12.2022

(Rozina Rehman) Aember (J)

e portadora

Certified in he ture onpr

Date of Presentation of Application _06-Number of Wordpogl Cop ag Fee Urerat.

Deteof Delivery of Copy

eha Paul)

Member (E)

Norbe

Date of C