

18th April, 2023

1. Junior of counsel for the appellant present. Mr. Muhammad Jan, District Attorney for the respondents present.

2. Former seeks adjournment on the ground that learned senior counsel for the appellant is not available. Last chance is given to learned counsel for the appellant for arguments, failing which the case will be decided on the basis of available record without the arguments. To come up for arguments on 21.06.2023 before the D.B. P.P given to the parties.



(Fareeha Paul)
Member (E)



(Kalim Arshad Khan)
Chairman

Fazle Subhan P.S

10.11.2022


Junior to counsel for the appellant present.

Kabir Ullah Khattak learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents for respondents present.

Former requested for adjournment on the ground that his senior counsel is busy before Hon'ble Peshawar High Court Peshawar. Adjourned. To come up for arguments on 09.01.2023 before D.B.

SCANNED
PESHAWAR


(Fareeha Paul)
Member (E)


(Rozina Rehman)
Member (J)


09.01.2023


Junior of learned counsel for the appellant present. Mr. Naseer-ud-Din Shah, Assistant Advocate General for the respondents present.

Junior of learned counsel for the appellant submitted rejoinder, copy of which handed over to learned Assistant Advocate General.

Junior of learned counsel for the appellant also requested for adjournment on the ground that learned counsel for the appellant is busy in the august Peshawar High Court, Peshawar. Adjourned. To come up for arguments on 18.04.2023 before D.B.

SCANNED
KPST
PESHAWAR


(Mian Muhammad)
Member (E)


(Salah-ud-Din)
Member (J)

23rd June, 2022

Junior of the counsel for appellant present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Additional AG for respondents present.

Respondents have not submitted written reply/comments. Learned AAG seeks time for submission of written reply/comments. To come up for written reply/comments on 16.08.2022 before S.B.




(Kalim Arshad Khan)
Chairman

16.08.2022

Junior of learned counsel for the appellant present. Mr. Kabirullah Khattak, Additional Advocate General alongwith Mr. Gul Zad, SI for the respondents present.

Reply/comments on behalf of respondents submitted which are placed on file. Copy of the same is handed over to junior of learned counsel for the appellant. Adjourned. To come up for rejoinder, if any, and arguments on 10.11.2022 before D.B.




(Mian Muhammad)
Member (E)

22.04.2022

Counsel for the appellant present.

Learned counsel for the appellant argued the case in preliminary hearing. He contended that the appellant was implicated in FIR No. 1298 dated 04.12.2018 under Section 302-34 PPC, Police Station Inqilab Peshawar and arrested on 05.12.2018. The appellant was bailed out on 03.01.2022 by Peshawar High Court. On departmental side, disciplinary proceedings were however, initiated against him when he was placed under suspension on 12.03.2019 and then dismissed from service vide impugned order dated 11.10.2019. He filed departmental appeal against the impugned order on 18.01.2022 subsequent to his release on bail which was rejected vide appellate order dated 31.01.2022. His revision petition also met the same fate when turned down on 01.04.2022. Where-after he preferred the instant service appeal on 18.04.2022. It was further contended that the appellant is still under trial in the judicial/criminal case and is on bail, not acquitted of the charges as yet, the respondents were therefore, required under Rule 16.3 of the Police Rules, 1934 to have placed him under suspension till culmination of the judicial proceedings against him. The appellant being civil servant involved in a criminal case made a futile attempt to challenge the departmental penalty before his acquittal, only on the basis of bail by the Competent Court of Law. He relied on PLD 2010 Supreme Court 695 and 2012 PLC (C:S) 627. He further argued that the impugned order are illegal and void while placing reliance on PLJ 2000 Tr.C (Services) 181, PLD 2003 Karachi 691, 2003. Moreover, limitation would not run against wrong, illegal, unlawful, void ab-initio orders as the appellant had not been heard in a regular inquiry because no charge sheet/statement of allegation ever served on him and as such the impugned orders are not sustainable, may graciously be set aside and the appellant be reinstated in service with all back benefits.

The appeal is admitted to regular hearing subject to all just legal objections. The appellant is directed to deposit security and process fee within 10 days. Thereafter notices be issued to respondents for submission of reply/comments. To come up for reply/comments on 23.06.2022 before S.B.


(Mian Muhammad)
Member(E)

Rs. 600/-
Appellant Deposited
Security & Process Fee
A. J. Hashmi
27/4/22

**BEFORE THE HONBLE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
SERVICES TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

In Re S.A 617 /2022

Hameed Ullah

VERSUS

Inspector General of Police and Others


INDEX

<i>S#</i>	<i>Description of Documents</i>	<i>Annex</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1.	Grounds of Appeal		1-4
2.	Affidavit.		5
3.	Addresses of Parties.		6
4.	Copies of FIR and Mad Report	"A & B"	7-8
5.	Copy of suspension order	"C"	9
6.	Copy of impugned Office Order Dated 11-10-2019	"D"	10
7.	Copies of Bail application & Judgement / Order are	"E" & "F"	11-17
8.	Copies of Departmental Appeal and impugned Office Order Dated 31-01-2022	"G" & "H"	18-19
9.	Copies of impugned Office Order Dated 01-04-2022	"I"	20-21
10.	Other Document		22
11.	Wakalatnama		23

Dated: 18/04/2022


Appellant

Through


JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate High Court Peshawar.

Off Add: B-1-Nimrah Centre, Govt College Chowk Peshawar

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICES TRIBUNAL
PESHAWAR**

In S.A. 617/2022

Hameed Ullah (Ex-LHC No. 940) S/o Muhammad Ashraf R/o Ghazni Kheli
Sorazai Payan, Peshawar

-----Appellant

VERSUS

1. Inspector General of Police, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
2. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Counter Terrorism Department, Khyber
Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar Region.
3. Superintendent of Police, CTD, Peshawar.
4. Capital City Police Officer, Peshawar.

-----Respondents

**Appeal u/s 4 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Services
Tribunal Act - 1974 against the impugned Dismissal
Order No. 6047-54/R/Pesh Dated 11-10-2019 issued by
Superintendent of Police, Counter Terrorism Department,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar Region, whereby the
Appellant was Dismissed from Service and against the
Impugned Office Order No. 1805/11/EC/CTD Dated 31-01-
2022, whereby the Departmental Appeal of the Appellant
was turned down and against the Impugned Office Order
No. S/623/22 Dated 01-04-2022, whereby the Revision
Petition of the Appellant was also turned down in a
classically, cursory and whimsical manner.**

Respectfully Sheweth,

1. That the Appellant is a bona-fide citizen of Islamic Republic of Pakistan
and hails from a respectable family.
2. That after going through the mandatorily required criteria, the Appellant
got onto the rolls of the Respondent Department years back and got
promoted as LHC No. 940 DFU Rural circle, CTD, Peshawar Region.

3. That since induction into service and after getting onto the rolls of this extremely humane and prestigious Department, the Appellant has remained the most pragmatic, devoted and dutiful fellow, who never left any stone unturned in performance of his duties and importing any responsibility that has been entrusted to the Appellant.
4. That being highly professional and pragmatic towards the responsibilities bestowed upon the shoulders of the Appellant and because of his whetted professional skills, there have never been any sort of soot or sootage upon his long career, which fact is reflected from Appellant's Service record, which sans any complaint or adverse or even advisory remarks mentioned or ever communicated to the Appellant.
5. That it was in the backdrop of December 2018 that when the Appellant was reportedly involved in a criminal case bearing FIR No. 1298 dated 04-12-2018 U/S 302-34 PPC at Police Station Inqilab Peshawar. **(Copies of FIR and Mad Report are annexed herewith as annexure "A" & "B")**
6. That it is a human nature that if someone is booked in a criminal case, in order to save his life, one has to abscond, and same has been done by the Appellant and he remained absconder for two years in order to save his life, which was beyond his control, hence the Appellant was unable to perform his duties.
7. That the service of the Appellant was suspended from the rolls of Respondent Department vide Office Order No. 625-28 Dated 12-03-2019 on the alleged ground of his involvement in criminal case registered at Police Station Inqilab. **(Copy of suspension order is annexed herewith as annexure "C").**
8. That an inquiry got conducted against the Appellant & thereafter, the Appellant was dismissed from the rolls of the Respondent Department vide Office Order No. 6047-54/R/Pesh Dated 11-10-2019 of the Office of Superintendent of Police, Counter Terrorism Department, Peshawar Region, in a classical, cursory and whimsical manner. **(Copy of impugned Office Order Dated 11-10-2019 is annexed herewith as Annexure "D").**
9. That it would be of equal importance to mention here that the Appellant surrendered himself before the Court of Law and moved Bail Applications for his release, and the Bail plea of the Appellant got confirmed by the Hon'ble Peshawar high Court Peshawar vide Order Dated 03-01-2022. **(Copies of Bail application & Judgement / Order are annexed herewith as annexure "E" & "F").**

10. That soon after his release, the Appellant preferred a Departmental Appeal Dated 18-01-2022 for his reinstatement into service but there was no light to the end of the tunnel and the Departmental Appeal of the Appellant was turned down vide Office Order No. 1805-11/EC/CTD Dated 31-01-2022. **(Copies of Departmental Appeal and impugned Office Order Dated 31-01-2022 are annexed herewith as annexures "G" & "H")**
11. That feeling aggrieved from the acts of the Respondent Department, the Appellant moved a Revision / Mercy Petition to the Worthy Inspector General of Police for his re-instatement into service, but the same was also turned down vide impugned Office Order No. No. 5782/GC dated 01-04-2022. **(Copies of impugned Office Order Dated 01-04-2022 is annexed herewith as annexures "I")**
12. That feeling aggrieved from the supra-mentioned episode, the grievances, that comes into existence, having no other adequate remedy available elsewhere, and forum to be addressed at, the Appellant approaches this Hon'ble Tribunal for his re-instatement into service, upon the following grounds, inter-alia;

Grounds:


- A. That the impugned Dismissal, Appellate, as well as the Revisional Orders are wrong, illegal, unlawful, void-ab-initio and is not sustainable at all.
- B. That all the impugned orders are unwarranted, illogical and against the Rules so therefore not tenable in the eyes of law.
- C. That no proper inquiry was ever conducted in case of the Appellant, nor the Appellant was ever heard in person, thus the appellant was condemned unheard which is illegal, unlawful, which is not justified in any canon of law.
- D. That no Charge Sheet, no statement of allegation was ever served upon the Appellant, thus mandatory instruments of Law are missing in case of the Appellant.
- E. That the Appellant was charged in a criminal case and was absconding, thus could not report to the department and on the other hand the department took the same as deliberate absence from duty and was proceeded against departmentally.
- F. That even the revision petition of the appellant was turned down on the ground of being badly time barred, regardless of looking into the fact that the Appellate and Revisional Authority has no power at present stage to pass the impugned orders.

- G. That the appellant has served the respondent department for many years and that too unblemished, without any complaint ever against, on part of the Appellant.
- H. That from every angle the Appellant is liable to be re-instated into service with all back benefits.
- I. That any other ground not raised here may graciously be allowed at the time of arguments.

It is, therefore, most humbly prayed that on acceptance of the instant appeal, the impugned Office Order No. 6047-54/R/Pesh, Dated 11-10-2019 of the office of Superintendent of Police, CTD, Peshawar, Region, whereby the Appellant was dismissed from Service, and the impugned Office Order No. 1805-11/EC/CTD, Dated 31-01-2022, whereby the Departmental Appeal of the Appellant was turned down and the Impugned Office Order No. S/623/22 Dated 01-04-2022 of the Office of Inspector General of Police Khyber Pakhtunkhwa may very graciously be set-aside and by doing so the Appellant may very graciously be re-instated into Service with all back benefits.

Any other relief not specifically asked for may also graciously be extended in favor of the appellant in the circumstances of the case.


Dated: 16-04-2022


 Appellant
 Through
 Javed Iqbal Gulbela
 Advocate,
 Supreme Court of Pakistan

Saghir Iqbal Gulbela
 &
 Ahsan Sardar
 Advocates, High Court,
 Peshawar.

NOTE:-

No such like appeal for the same appellant, upon the same subject matter has earlier been filed by me, prior to the instant one, before this Hon'ble Tribunal.


 Advocate

5

**BEFORE THE HONBLE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
SERVICES TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

In Re S.A _____/2022

Hameed Ullah


VERSUS

Inspector General of Police and Others

AFFIDAVIT

I, Hameed Ullah (Ex-LHC No. 940) S/o Muhammad Ashraf R/o Ghazni Kheli Sorazai Payan, Peshawar do hereby solemnly affirm and declare that all the contents of the accompanied appeal is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed or withheld from this Hon'ble Tribunal.

DEPONENT



CNIC#14301-5115847-3

Identified By:

Javed Iqbal Gulbela
Advocate High Court
Peshawar.



18/11/22

6

**BEFORE THE HONBLE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
SERVICES TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

In Re S.A _____/2022

Hameed Ullah

VERSUS

Inspector General of Police and Others

ADDRESSES OF PARTIES


APPELLANT.

Hameed Ullah (Ex-LHC No. 940) S/o Muhammad Ashraf R/o Ghazni Kheli
Sorazai Payan, Peshawar


RESPONDENTS:

5. Inspector General of Police, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
6. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Counter Terrorism Department, Khyber
Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar Region.
7. Superintendent of Police, CTD, Peshawar.
8. Capital City Police Officer, Peshawar.

Dated: 18/04/2022


Appellant

Through


JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate High Court Peshawar.

RoR-94
12-03-19

9

Ann C

ORDER

IHC Hamidullah No. 940 while posted in DFU Rural CTD Peshawar, was reportedly involved in Case FIR No 1298 dated 04-12-2018 u/s 302-34 PPC PS Inqilab Peshawar. He is absented vide DD No 20 dated 05-12-2018 to till date, PS CTD Peshawar.

His salary is hereby stopped with immediate effect and till the findings of the inquiry being initiated.

OB No. 79/CD

Dated. 12/03/2019

Superintendent of Police,
Counter Terrorism Department (CTD)
Peshawar Region

No. 625-28 Dated Peshawar 13/03/2019.

Copy of the above is forwarded for information and necessary action to:-

1. DSP DFU Rural CTD Peshawar.
2. Accountant CTD Hqrs: Peshawar
3. SHO PS CTD Peshawar.
4. OASI CTD Hqrs: Peshawar.

Sir, noted PL

DSP in R
13-3-19

JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)



(10)

Ann D²

OFFICE OF THE:
 SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
 COUNTER TERRORISM DEPARTMENT,
 PESHAWAR, REGION.
 No. 0047-54/R/Pesh.
 Dated 11-10-2019.

ORDER


Order is passed to day on 11-10-2019 to dispose of departmental proceedings initiated against Hameed Ullah No. 940 while posted at DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar. Hameed Ullah was charge sheeted on dated 05-12-2018 vide letter No. 1115/R/Pesh on the score on the following allegations.


1. It has been reported by DSP, DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar that he has been found involved in the case FIR No. 1298 dated 04-12-2018 u/s 302-34 PPC PS Inqilab District Peshawar.
2. He has also been suspended vide this office order No. 1113/R/Pesh dated 05-12-2018 due to involvement in the above captioned section of law.
3. All this speaks highly adverse on his part which is against Police disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with Amendment 2014.

While conducting probe into the allegations leveled against IHC Hameed Ullah, Mr. Samin Jan DSP DFU CTD Peshawar was appointed as an enquiry officer. The enquiry officer found him guilty. The above named Constable is reluctant to appear before the enquiry officer as well as before investigation officer of the case. A final show cause was also issued to him vide this office order number 5676/R/Pesh, dated 23-09-2019, which was served upon his cousin namely Mr. Muhammad Parhan s/o Rahim Dad Khan r/o Surazar Payan, but he stated that the accused is not present at home, nor any information about his whereabouts. In view of all the facts and figures, he is recommended for major punishment of dismissal from service.

Being Habib SUPERINTENDENT of police CTD Peshawar region being competent and satisfied with the recommendation of Enquiry officer, therefore IHC Hameed Ullah be awarded punishment of dismissal from service.

For announced
 O.E. 104
 D.O. 11-10-2019


 (Tariq Habib)
 Superintendent of Police,
 Counter Terrorism Department (CTD)
 Peshawar Region.


 JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
 Advocate
 Supreme Court of Pakistan
 (ASC# 6317)

is forwarded for information to:
 1. Dy. DIO CTD Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
 2. Senior Superintendent of Police Operation Central Zone CTD HQs: Peshawar.
 3. Senior Superintendent of Police, Operation/Investigation CCP, Peshawar.

11

Ann E



BEFORE THE PESHAWAR HIGH COURT PESHAWAR.

Cr.M. B.A No 4375 P /2021

Hameed Ullah s/o Muhammad Ashraf
R/o Ghazni Kheil sorazai Payan Peshawar.....Petitioner

V E R S U S

- 1. The State
- 2. Inyat Ullah s/o Gul Khan
R/o Sorazai Payan Peshawar..... Respondents

Case FIR No 1298 Dated 4/12/20218
U/S 302/34-PPC
P.S Inqilab (Peshawar)

=====
Application U/s 497-Crpc for the release of the
accused / Petitioner on bail till the final disposal of the
Case.
=====

Respectfully Sheweth:-

- 1. That the accused/petitioner stand charged in the instant case by the complainant and since his arrest he is in judicial lock up.
(Copy of FIR is annexed "A")
- 2. That the accused/petitioner submitted bail application in the court of ASJ Peshawar but the same was dismissed on 6/12/ 2021
(Order is annex B& C)
- 3. That Now the accused / petitioner seeks his release on bail on the following grounds amongst other:-

GROUND S.

A That the accused/ petitioner is innocent in the instant case and has been implicated falsely and maliciously for ulterior motive by the complainant .

B. That except bare allegations in FIR there is no cogent evidence available on file to connect the accused/petitioner with the commission of offence.

C. That co-accused Namely Suliman with similar role has already been granted bail in the instant case by the trail court due to non availability of the complainant as well as of the alleged eye witness.

FILED TODAY

Deputy Registrar

08 DEC 2021

JAVED IQBAL GULBELAGI
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

ATTESTED
EXAMINER
Peshawar High Court

12


2

- D. That the story of prosecution is based on surmises and conjecture.
- E. That there is no direct or Indirect evidence available on record to connect accused/petitioner with the alleged occurrence.
- F. That the circumstaional evidence negates the version of the complainant .
- G. That no recovery has been effected from the accused/ petitioner.
- H. That the charged leveled against the accused/ petitioner required further probe in the case and as such , the case of accused/ petitioner requires further inquiry.
- I. That on permission of this Hon:ble Court , the accused/ petitioner may argue other grounds, at the time of arguments.
- J. That the accused/petitioner is ready to furnish reliable sureties for the entire satisfaction of this Hon:ble Court.

It is therefore, most humbly prayed that on acceptance of this bail application , the accused/petitioner may graciously be release on bail till the final disposal of the case.

Through

Petitioner



(HUSSAIN ALI)
ASC, Peshawar



(Rehmat Ullah)
Advocate Peshawar

NOTE:-

As per instruction of my client certified that no such bail application has been filed by the petitioner, before this Hon:ble Court.

JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

FILED TODAY
Deputy Registrar
08 DEC 2021


ADVOCATE

ATTESTED
EXAMINER
Peshawar High Court

(B)

Ann F

JUDGMENT SHEET
PESHAWAR HIGH COURT, PESHAWAR
(JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT)

Cr.M (BA) No.4375-PI/2021

Hameed Ullah Vs. The State etc.



JUDGMENT.

Date of hearing: 03.01.2022

Mr. Hussain Ali, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rabia Gul, Advocate, for the State.

Nemo for the complainant.

WIQAR AHMAD, J.- The petitioner Hameed Ullah seeks his release on bail in case FIR No.1298 dated 04.12.2018 registered under section 302/34 PPC at Police Station Inqilab, Peshawar. Earlier, petitioner was refused bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge-II/Model Criminal Court, Peshawar, vide order dated 06.12.2021, wherein accused/petitioner alongwith co-accused Suleman and Ameer Nawaz had been charged for the murder of two persons namely Inam and Ihsan.

2. Despite service complainant is absent.
3. Arguments heard. Record perused.
4. Perusal of record reveals that co-accused namely Suleman has been released on bail by the learned trial Court

JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

ATTESTED
EXAMINER
Peshawar High Court

after the eye-witnesses failed to turn up before the Trial Court for getting their statements recorded. Relevant observations of the learned trial Court is reproduced for ready reference;

"3. The Court cannot keep the accused behind the bars for indefinite period so that the complainant may decide at his whims when to attend the Court for recording evidence, as doing so will be doing injustice to the principle of "the Accused is innocent unless and until proven guilty" and of "a fair trial". However, on the other hand, acquitting the Accused of a murder charge due to the reluctant of the complainant to appear and depose without completion of the trial might in peculiar circumstances also work hand to the cause of the deceased and his legal heirs. Sufficient time has been given in the instant case to the complainant to appear and record his evidence, but to no avail.4.

Although, the Court of Sessions has no specified power u/s or like 249 of the Cr.PC to stop proceedings, however, as, held by the august Supreme Court of Pakistan in case titled "Shadi Khan Vs Muhammad Saleem and 03 others, reported as PLD 1978 SC 38, that the trial Court in situations like this has the power to stop proceedings, and grant the Accused a bail, if they are behind the bars.

Thus, in order to strike a balance between the parties, proceedings in the instant case are stopped due to the non-availability of the private witness/complainant, in recognition of the principle "Accused is innocent unless and until proven guilty" on the one hand and not affecting the case and cause of the deceased on the other, "Until the availability of the complainant and his private PWs for recording statement." The accused Suleman be released on bail subject to submission of

JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

ATTESTED
EXAMINER
Peshawar High Court

bail bonds in the sum of Rs.5,00,000/- with two sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of this Court. Order regarding the remaining Accused Amir Nawaz , Jehanzeb and Hameed Ullah having been considered absconders shall remain intact. Entire judicial file be consigned to the record room after completion”

Though case of the accused/petitioner is not at par with said co-accused who had faced trial for longer period of time but this appears that eye-witnesses of the occurrence would also display a similar attitude in the trial against the present accused/petitioner.

5. Perusal of record also reveals that the Investigating Officer had recovered 06 empties of 7.62 bore and 03 empties of 9-MM. As per FSL report dated 17.12.2018 all the above mentioned empties of 7.62 bore had been fired from one and the same weapon, whereas empties of 9-MM mentioned above have also been fired from one and same weapon, which makes case against the accused/petitioner that of further probe. A wide net appears to have been thrown by the complainant where four persons have been given role of effective firing. In this regard reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan in Criminal Petition No.1183 of 2021, wherein the Hon'ble Court has extended bail to the accused in somewhat similar circumstances. Relevant observations of

JAVED IOBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

ATTESTED
EXAMINER
Peshawar High Court

the august Court are reproduced hereunder for ready reference;

"As per the contents of the crime report, the allegation levelled against the petitioner is that he along with four co-accused while armed with firearms has launched an attack on the complainant party and due to fire shots made by them two persons have been done to death. However, we have noted that only a general role of firing has been ascribed to the petitioner and no details have been given as to what kind of weapon the petitioner had used and on which parts of the body of the deceased, the alleged fire shots made by him landed. We have also noted that from the place of occurrence, 27 empties were taken into possession, which according to the report of the FSL were found to be fired from one and the same weapon. In this view of the matter, when the role ascribed to the petitioner is of general nature and according to the report of FSL only one weapon was used in the commission of the crime, it is the Trial Court who after recording of evidence would decide about the guilt or otherwise of he petitioner and until then the petitioner cannot be kept behind the bars for an indefinite period. Keeping in view all the facts and circumstances, the case of the petitioner squarely falls within the purview of Section 497(2) Cr.PC entitling for further inquiry into his guilt."

5. The accused/petitioner has remained absconder for a consider long time but absconsion cannot be made ground for refusal of bail, if the case is otherwise fit for the grant of bail. Reference in this respect may be made to case law reported as 2016 SCMR 1520, 1985 SCMR 382, PLD 1985 SC 182, PLD 2012 SC 222 and 2012 SCMR 1137.

6. Resultantly, this bail application is allowed and the accused-petitioner, named above, is admitted to bail provided he furnishes bail bonds in the sum of Rs.800,000/-

JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

ATTESTED
EXAMINER
Peshawar High Court

(Eight lac) with two sureties, each in like amount to the satisfaction of learned Illaqa/Duty Judicial Magistrate, who shall ensure that the sureties are local, reliable and men of means.

Announced
03.01.2022

JUDGE

Inshan (SB) Hon'ble Mr. Justice Wiqar Ahmad.

05 JAN 2022

No. 18852
Date of Presentation of Application 05/01/22
No of Pages 70
Copying fee 1
Total 28
Date of Preparation 05/01/22
Date of Delivery of Copy 05/01/22
Received By [Signature]

JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

OFFICE OF THE,
DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
COUNTER TERRORISM DEPARTMENT,
KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PESHAWAR.

(19)

Ann 14

ORDER

Ex-IIC Hameed Ullah No. 940 while posted in DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar Region was involved in case vide FIR No. 1298 dated 04-12-2018 U/S 302-34 Peshawar District Peshawar. He was issued charged sheet and summary of allegation by SP CTD Peshawar Region and DSP Sameen Jan nominated as enquiry officer to probe into the matter. The enquiry officer submitted his findings and the above named official was declared guilty.

In this regard SP CTD Peshawar Region awarded him major punishment i.e. "Removal from Service" vide order No. 6047-54/R/Pesh dated 11-10-2019. The applicant made departmental appeal after lapse of two years three months before the Worthy Deputy Inspector General of Police CTD Khyber Pakhtunkhwa for re-instatement. However, the authority has upheld the punishment & case has been filed being badly time barred.

SP/HQrs:
For Deputy Inspector General of Police,
CTD, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
Peshawar.

(1)

Date: Peshawar: 31/01/2022

Copy of above is forwarded for information and necessary action to the:-

✓ Superintendent of Police, CTD Peshawar Region.
Accounts Offr, PSO, OASI, SRC, MHC CTD HQrs, Peshawar
Hameed Ullah No. 940

DSP Saddler

For information

SP/CTD Peshawar

JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)



(20) Ann I

**OFFICE OF THE
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
Central Police Office, Peshawar.**

No. S/ 623 /22, dated Peshawar the 01/04/2022.

To: The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Counter Terrorism Department,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.

Subject:- **REVISION PETITION.**


Memo:

The Competent Authority has examined and filed the revision petition submitted by Ex-LHC Hameed Ullah No. 940 of CTD, Peshawar Region against the punishment of dismissal from service awarded by Superintendent of Police, CTD, Peshawar Region vide order No. 6047-54/R/Pesh, dated 11/10/2019, being badly time barred.


The applicant may please be informed accordingly.


(NOOR AFGHAN)
Registrar,

For Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar. *afe*


JAVED IQBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

21



50/13

OFFICE OF THE
CAPITAL CITY POLICE OFFICER,
PESHAWAR

Phone No. 091-9210989

Fax: 091-9212597

No. 5782 /GC, Dated Peshawar the 24/03/2022.

To: The Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar.

Subject: REVISION PETITION.

Memo:

Please refer to your office Memo: No. 528/22, dated 17.03.2022 on the subject cited above.

In this connection, a copy of Court Judgment alongwith written statement of Ex-LHC Hameed Ullah No. 940 of CTD Peshawar is submitted herewith as desired, please.

Encls: (05)

(WASEEM AHMAD KHALIL) SSP/Coord:
FOR CAPITAL CITY POLICE OFFICER,
PESHAWAR

Supdt. General
24.03.2022

JAVED IOBAL GULBELA
Advocate
Supreme Court of Pakistan
(ASC # 5317)

420/22
25/03/22

01/3/22

وکالت نامہ

بعدالت: جنیبر پختونخواہ سروسز ٹریڈنگ کمپنی لمیٹڈ

حمید اللہ بنام آئی۔ جی۔ پی۔ کے پی کے

منجانب ایپیلنٹ دعویٰ سروس ایپیل

تاریخ 18-04-2022

باعث تحریر آنکہ مقدمہ مندرجہ بالا عنوان اپنی طرف سے واسطے پیروی و جوابدہی

بمقام کیلے جاویدا اقبال گل بیلہ ایڈووکیٹ سپریم کورٹ آف پاکستان

کو بدیں شرط دیکل مقرر کیا ہے۔ کہ میں ہر پیشی کا کوڈ یا بزرگیہ مختار خاص روبرو عدالت حاضر ہوتا رہوں گا۔ اور بوقت پکارے

جانے مقدمہ وکیل صاحب موصوف کو اطلاع دے کر حاضر دالت کرونگا، اگر پیشی پر من مظہر حاضر نہ ہوا اور مقدمہ میری غیر

حاضری کی وجہ سے کسی طور پر میرے برخلاف ہو گیا تو صاحب موصوف اس کے کسی طرح ذمہ دار نہ ہونگے۔ نیز وکیل صاحب

موصوف صدر مقام کچہری کی کسی اور جگہ یا کچہری کے مقررہ اوقات سے پہلے یا پیچھے یا بروز تعطیل پیروی کرنے کے ذمہ دار نہ

ہونگے۔ اگر مقدمہ علاوہ صدر مقام کچہری کے کسی اور جگہ سماعت ہونے یا بروز تعطیل یا کچہری کے اوقات کے آگے پیچھے پیش

ہونے پر من مظہر کو کوئی نقصان پہنچے تو اس کے ذمہ دار یا اس کے واسطے کسی معاوضہ کے ادا کرنے یا مختار نہ واپس کرنے کے بھی

صاحب موصوف ذمہ دار نہ ہونگے۔ مجھے کوکل پر داخنتہ صاحب موصوف مثل کردہ ذات خود منظور و قبول ہوگا۔ اور صاحب کو

عرضی دعویٰ و جواب دعویٰ اور درخواست جرائے ڈگری و نظر ثانی اپیل و نگرانی ہر قسم کی درخواست پر دستخط و تصدیق کرنے کا بھی

اختیار ہوگا اور کسی حکم یا ڈگری کے اجراء کرنے اور ہر قسم کے روپیہ وصول کرنے اور رسید دینے اور داخل کرنے اور ہر قسم کے

بیان دینے اور سپروٹاشی و راضی نامہ فیصلہ پر خلاف کرنے اقبال دعویٰ دینے کا بھی اختیار ہوگا۔ اور بصورت اپیل و برآمدگی

مقدمہ یا منسوخی ڈگری یکطرفہ درخواست حکم انتہائی یا قرتی یا گرفتاری قبل اجراء ڈگری بھی موصوف کو بشرط ادائیگی علیحدہ مختار

نہ پیروی کا اختیار ہوگا۔ اور بصورت ضرورت صاحب موصوف کو بھی اختیار ہوگا یا مقدمہ مذکورہ یا اس کے کسی جزو کی کاروائی کے

واسطے یا بصورت اپیل، اپیل کے واسطے دوسرے وکیل یا بیرسٹر کو بجائے اپنے یا اپنے ہمراہ مقرر کریں اور ایسے مشیر قانون کے

ہر امر وہی اور ویسے ہی اختیارات حاصل ہونگے جیسے کے صاحب موصوف کو حاصل ہیں۔ اور دوران مقدمہ میں جو کچھ ہر جانہ

التواء پڑے گا۔ اور صاحب موصوف کا حق ہوگا۔ اگر وکیل صاحب موصوف کو پوری فیس تاریخ پیشی سے پہلے ادا نہ کرونگا تو

صاحب موصوف کو پورا اختیار ہوگا کہ مقدمہ کی پیروی نہ کریں اور ایسی صورت میں میرا کوئی مطالبہ کسی قسم کا صاحب موصوف

کے برخلاف نہیں ہوگا۔ لہذا مختار نامہ لکھ دیا کہ سندر ہے۔

موزعہ 18-04-2022 مضمون مختار نامہ سن لیا ہے اور اچھی طرح سمجھ لیا ہے اور منظور ہے۔

Handwritten signature and text on the right margin.

Handwritten note in the top left corner.

Accepted by [Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA
SERVICES TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR.

Service Appeal No. 617/2022.

Title: "Hameed Ullah V/S IGP KP & Others"

INDEX

S. No	Documents	Page No. (From-To)
1	Index	01
2	Comments	02-05
3	Affidavit	06
4	Authority Letter	07
5	List of previous punishment/ bad entries as "Annexure A"	08-15

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICES TRIBUNAL
PESHAWAR.

Service Appeal No. 617/2022.

Hameed Ullah (Ex-LHC No. 940) S/o Muhammad Ashraf R/o Ghazni Kheli Sorazai
Payan, Peshawar

.....(Appellant)

VERSUS

1. **Inspector General of Police, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.**
2. **Deputy Inspector General of Police, Counter Terrorism Department Khyber
Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar Region.**
3. **Superintendent of Police, CTD Peshawar.**
4. **Capital City Police Officer, Peshawar.**

.....(Respondents)

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICES TRIBUNAL
PESHAWAR.

Service Appeal No. 617/2022.

COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENTS (01, 02, 03 & 04).

Respectfully Sheweth

The para-wise reply of the respondents is as under.

Preliminary Objections:-

- a) The appellant has no cause of action or locus standi to file the appeal.
- b) The appeal is not maintainable in the present form.
- c) The appeal is bad for mis-joinder and non-joinder of necessary parties.
- d) The appellant is estopped to file the appeal by his own conduct.
- e) The appeal is barred by law and limitation.
- f) The appellant has not come to the Honorable Tribunal with clean hands.

FACTS:-

1. Personal information of appellant, hence no comments.
2. Pertains to record, hence no comments.
3. The performance of appellant was not up to the mark. List of previous punishment/ bad entries are annexed as "A".
4. As explained in above para.
5. Correct to the extent that the appellant was directly charged in FIR No. 1398 dated 04.12.2018 u/s 302/ 34 PPC registered at PS Inqilab Peshawar.
6. Incorrect, the appellant is only trying to waste the precious time of this Hon'ble Tribunal. Avoiding criminal proceedings initiated against the appellant is in itself a criminal act. If the appellant was innocent, he had to face the proceedings and would willfully appear before concerned police/ Investigating Officer in the case and provide sufficient proof to him (investigating officer) qua his being innocent but instead of facing the criminal proceedings he remained absconder for two years. On this point his service appeal needs to be dismissed.
7. Correct to the extent that appellant was suspended, charge sheeted and statement of allegations were issued to him after carrying out proper departmental inquiry. Various Notices were also issued to the appellant but he never bothered to appear before inquiry officer and thus remained absconder from criminal proceedings. Besides this, he also remained absent

from his lawful duties which is another proof regarding his involvement in murder case.

8. Incorrect, inquiry officer had issued various notices to the appellant with directions to appear but he (appellant) ignored the same. The inquiry officer submitted his finding report and recommended that he might be removed from service as there is no chance for him (appellant) to join back his duties in near future and face the criminal proceedings. Accordingly he was dismissed from service.
9. Incorrect, as admitted by the appellant in para 06 of his service appeal that he remained absconder for a period of two years. Police is a disciplined force and it is not possible for department to wait for two years and the appellant was thus awarded with major punishment of "Dismissal from Service".
10. Incorrect, his departmental appeal was badly time barred (submitted his departmental appeal after elapse of two years and three months) and hence was filed by competent authority.
11. Correct to the extent that badly time barred case cannot be entertained by department.
12. Incorrect, appellant willfully remained absconder for two years and also did not bother to appear before inquiry officer, therefore, he has no right to knock the doors of Tribunal for any relief.


GROUND


- A. Incorrect, all the orders passed against the appellant are legal, lawful, convincing and needs to be upheld.
- B. Incorrect, all the orders passed by competent authority are logical as per the prevailing law and rules and needs to be upheld.
- C. Incorrect, proper first charge sheet along with statement of allegations was issued which was received by his brother **Nazir Ullah**. Likewise, a final show cause to also issued to him which was received by his cousin namely **The appellant** neither bothered to appear before inquiry officer nor had submitted his reply.
- D. Incorrect, proper charge sheet along with statement of allegations was issued to the appellant which was received by his brother **Nazir Ullah** and the Final Show notice by his cousin **Farhan**. The appellant remained absconder, willfully remained absent and did not join his duty.


- E. Correct, appellant acknowledged once again regarding his illegal act of absconding and avoided facing legal proceedings. On this point, it is humbly request to dismiss his service appeal.
- F. Incorrect, all the order passed by competent authorities need to be supported/ upheld.
- G. Incorrect, appellant was directly charged in a murder case and had remained absconder willfully regarding which he himself has declared in this service appeal which is sufficient proof regarding his involvement in that case.
- H. Incorrect, the appellant is not entitled to claim for his reinstatement in service.
- I. That respondents also seek permission of this Hon'ble Tribunal to raise additional ground at the time of arguments.


Prayer:

In view of the above comments on facts and grounds, it is humbly prayed that the instant appeal may kindly be dismissed with costs.


Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
(Respondent No. 01)


Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
CTD, Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 02)


Capital City Police Officer,
Peshawar,
(Respondent No. 04)


Superintendent of Police,
CTD Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 03)

BEFORE THE SERVICE TRIBUNAL KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA.

Service Appeal No. 617/2022.

Hameed Ullah (Ex-LHC No. 940)


.....(Appellant)


VERSUS


IGP KP & Others.....(Respondents)


AFFIDAVIT

We, the below mentioned respondents, do here by solemnly affirm and declare on oath that the contents of reply submitted are correct and true to the best of our knowledge and belief and that nothing has been concealed from this Honorable Court.


Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
(Respondent No. 01)


Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
CTD, Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 02)


Capital City Police Officer,
Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 04)



Superintendent of Police,
CTD Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 03)





OFFICE OF THE
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA,
PESHAWAR.


AUTHORITY LETTER

We, the undersigned, do hereby authorize SI Gulzad Khan having CNIC# 17301-5214940-9, of CTD HQrs to submit reply in Service Appeal No. 617-P/ 2022 Titled "Hameed Ullah VS IGP & Others" and to pursue the matter on behalf of the undersigned.


Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
(Respondent No. 01)


Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,
CTD, Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 02)


Capital City Police Officer,
Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 04)


Superintendent of Police,
CTD Peshawar.
(Respondent No. 03)

ORDER

My this orders of today on 11-12-2017 disposed off departmental proceedings initiated against HC Hamid Ullah No. 940 while posted at DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar Region on the following score of allegations that:-


- I. It has been reported by DSP, DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar that you have been involved in case vide FIR No. 634 dated 06-11-2017 u/s 324-427-148-149 PS Inqilab District Peshawar.
- II. You have also been suspended vide this office order No. 13124-28/R/Pesh dated 08/11/2017.
- III. All this speaks highly adverse on your part and is against Police Disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with Amendment 2014.

The defaulter official has been Charge Sheeted and Mr. Rasheed Iqbal Khan DSP Inv: CTD Peshawar was appointed as an Enquiry Officer to proceed against him departmentally as per rules.

The enquiry officer submitted in his enquiry report that accused HC Hamid Ullah No. 940 had dispute with his cousins and got BBA from the Honorable Court on compromise & the enquiry officer recommended that he may be re-instated and the enquiry may be filed.

Now, I TARIQ HABIB KHAN, SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, CTD PESHAWAR REGION in exercise of the power conferred upon me under Police Rules 1975 read with Amendments 2014, taking a lenient view against the above mentioned HC and agreed with enquiry officer, and he is hereby re-instated in services from the date of the suspension and file his enquiry.

OB No. 286/CTD
Dated. 12/12/2017


(TARIQ HABIB KHAN)
Superintendent of Police,
CTD, Peshawar Region,
Peshawar.

No. 15019-22 PA/Pesh

Dated Peshawar the 12/12/2017

Copy of above is forwarded for information and necessary action to all concerned in CTD Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.

(9)


CHARGE SHEET.

1) I, TARIQ HABIB KHAN SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, CTD, PESHAWAR REGION as a Competent Authority, hereby charge you HC Hamid Ullah No. 940 presently posted at CTD Intelligence staff Rural Circle Peshawar on the following commissions & omissions that:-

- I. It has been reported by DSP, DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar that you have been involved in case vide FIR No. 634 dated 06-11-2017 u/s 324-427-148-149 PS Inqilab District Peshawar.
- II. You have also been suspended vide this office order No. 13124-28/R/Pesh dated 08/11/2017.
- III. All this speaks highly adverse on your part and is against Police Disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with Amendment 2014.

By reasons of the above, you appeared to be guilty of misconduct under Police Disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with Amendment 2014 and have rendered yourself liable to all or any of the penalties specified in the Rules:-

2. You are, therefore required to submit your written defence within 7 days of the receipt of this Charge Sheet to the Enquiry Officer as the case may be.
- 3). Your written defence, if any, should reach to the Enquiry Officer within the specified period failing which it shall be presumed that you have no defence to put in and in that case, exparte action will be taken against you.
- 4). You are also at liberty, if you wish to be heard in person.
- 5). Statement of allegations is enclosed.


(TARIQ HABIB KHAN)
Superintendent of Police,
CTD, Peshawar Region

(13)

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS.

I, TARIQ HABIB KHAN SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, CTD, PESHAWAR REGION, am of the opinion that HC Hamid Ullah No.940 presently posted at CTD Intelligence Staff Rural Circle Peshawar has rendered himself liable to be proceeded against as he committed the following acts/omissions within the meaning of Police Disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with Amendment 2014.

STATEMENT OF ALLEGATIONS.

It has been reported by DSP, DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar that he has been involved in case vide FIR No. 634 dated 06-11-2017 u/s 324-427-148-149 PS Inqilab District Peshawar. He has also been suspended vide this office order No. 13124-28/R/Pesh dated 08/11/2017. All this speaks highly adverse on his part and is against Police Disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with Amendment 2014.

2). For the purpose of scrutinizing the conduct of the said accused with reference to the above allegations, DSP Rasheed Aghwal of this Unit is appointed as Enquiry Officer, to conduct enquiry under the Rules.


3). The Enquiry Officer shall in accordance with the provision of the Police Disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with amendment 2014 provide reasonable opportunity of hearing to the accused, record the findings and make recommendations as to punishment or other appropriate action against the accused within 15 days of the receipt of this order.

No 5001-02 /R/Pesh

Dated Peshawar the 8-11 /2017.

Copy of above is forwarded to the:-

- 1). Enquiry Officer of this Unit are directed to initiate departmental proceedings against the accused under the Police Disciplinary Rules, 1975 read with Amendment 2014.
2. HC Hamid Ullah No. 940 to appear before the Enquiry Officer on the date and place fixed by the Enquiry Officer for the purpose of enquiry proceedings.


(TARIQ HABIB KHAN)
Superintendent of Police,
CTD, Peshawar Region.

(Signature)

12

ORDER

Head Constable Hamid Ullah No. 940 of this Unit presently posted at DFU Rural Circle Peshawar is hereby placed under suspension with immediate effect due to involvement in the case vide FIR No. 634 dated 06-11-2017 u/s 324-427-148-149 PS Inqilab Peshawar.

He will be separately issue charge Sheet along with statement of allegation with immediate effect.

O.B. 264/CTD
Dated 08-11-2017


(Signature)
Superintendent of Police,
CTD, Peshawar Region.
Dated Peshawar the 08/11/2017.

No 13124-28/R/Pesh

Copy of above is forwarded for information and necessary action to the:-

1. Worthy Deputy Inspector General of Police, CTD Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
2. DSP, DFU Rural Circle CTD Peshawar.
3. EC/OASI CTD Hqrs: Peshawar.

O/C



(13)

**IN THE COURT OF AABID SARWAR, ADDL:
SESSEIONS JUDGE-XIII, PESHAWAR.**

Case No. 831/BA of 2017

AMIR NAWAZ ETC ...VS... THE STATE

&

Case No. 837/BA of 2017

HAMEED ULLAH ETC ...VS... THE STATE

ORDER...03

08-11-2017.

Counsel for the accused/petitioners present. SPP for the State present. Counsel for the accused/petitioners (first party) also present.

2. The accused/petitioners namely Hameed Ullah and Nazeer Ullah vide bail petition No. 837/BA while accused/petitioners namely Amir Nawaz and Jehanzaib vide bail petition No. 831/BA seeks post arrest bail in case FIR No. 634 dated 06-11-2017 u/s 324/427/148/149 PPC of Police Station Inqilab, District Peshawar. Both the above mentioned petitions are the outcome of one and the same FIR; therefore, this single order shall stand for their disposal.

M. Siraj
9.11.17

M. Siraj
Peshawar

3. Facts of the case are that on 06-11-2017 Saleem Khan SHO complainant charged the accused/petitioners named above for the commission of offence for ineffectively firing on each other and causing damage to a motorcar.

ATTESTED

08 NOV 2017
[Signature]

C. Siraj

13

4. Today counsel for the accused/petitioners first party namely Zulfiqar and Khizar Hayat Advocate present and recorded their statement wherein they stated that they are counsel for the accused/petitioners of the first party and as per their direction they do not want to prosecute bail petitions, all the petitions are the outcome of the same and one FIR 634 dated 06-11-2017 u/s 324/427/148/149 PPC of Police Station Inqilab, District Peshawar and expressed their no objection on the release on bail of the accused/petitioners in the instant case and subsequent acquittal at trial stage. Cross firing was exchanged between the parties who are closely related to each other, during the occurrence non ~~few~~ any of the party got injured. The alleged firing was ineffective.

5. As accused/petitioners (first party) has entered into a genuine compromise with the accused/petitioners with their free will and in this respect counsel for the accused/petitioners of first party recorded compromise statement on behalf of accused/petitioners which shows that a genuine compromise has been effected with the accused/petitioners. The offence for which the accused/petitioners are charged is compoundable, therefore, on the acceptance of the compromise both the petitions bearing No. 831/BA and 837/BA are accepted and accused/petitioner Hameed Ullah, Nazeer Ullah, Amir Nawaz

W. Sidiq
8-11-17
Secty-II, Peshawar

ACCEPTED

60/30/17
(Signature)
Secty-II, Peshawar

(Signature)

Cont.Or...03
08/11/2017

(8) - (15)

and Jehanzaib are admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bond in the sum of Rs. 80,000/- (Eighty thousand) with two sureties each and in the like amount to the satisfaction of this court. File be consigned to record room after completion of compilation.

Announced.
08-11-2017

(AABID SARWAR),
Addl. Sessions Judge-XIII
Peshawar

No.	1644
Date of Application	09/11/17
Name of Applicant	Muhammad
Word	6-2400
Fee	
Signature of Court	
Date of Preparation	09-11-17
Date of Delivery	09-11-17

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE CO

09/11/2017
(Examiner)
Copying Agency Session Court
Peshawar