


Form- A

FORM OF ORDER SHEET

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

Implementation Petition No. 692/2023

S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge.
1	2	
1	26.09.2023	<p>The implementation petition of Mr. Muhammad Rehman submitted today by Roeda Khan Advocate. It is fixed for implementation report before Single Bench at Peshawar on <u>28-09-2023</u>. Original file be requisitioned. AAG has noted the next date.</p> <p>By the order of Chairman  REGISTRAR</p>

**BEFORE THE SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

**Service Appeal No 595/2019**

**Execution Petition No. 692 /2023**

Muhammad Rehman S/o Amroz Khan (Laboratory Assistant at Government Degree College Al Puri Shangla R/o Faiz Abad Tehsil Al-Puri District Shangla.

..... Appellant/Petitioner

**VERSUS**

1. Secretary Higher Education Department Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.


2. Director Higher Education Department Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Directorate at Peshawar.

..... Respondents


**Index**

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Description of documents</b>	<b>Annexure</b>	<b>Pages</b>
1.	Copy of petition		1-2
2.	Copy of Judgment dated 06.07.2021	A	3-12
3.	Copy of order sheet dated 07/07/2022 and implementation report dated 30.12.2021	B&C	13-15
4.	Wakalat Nama		14

Dated 26/09/2023

  
Appellant/Petitioner

Through

  
**Rooeda Khan**  
**Advocates High Court,**  
**Peshawar.**

(1)

**BEFORE THE SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

**Service Appeal No 595/2019**

**Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal**

Diary No. 7914

Dated 26-07-23

**Execution Petition No. 692/2023**

Muhammad Rehman S/o Amroz Khan (Laboratory Assistant at Government Degree College Al Puri Shangla R/o Faiz Abad Tehsil Al-Puri District Shangla.

..... Appellant/Petitioner

**VERSUS**

1. Secretary Higher Education Department Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
2. Director Higher Education Department Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Directorate at Peshawar.

..... Respondents

**EXECUTION PETITION FOR DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS FOR PROPERLY AND PRACTICALLY IMPLEMENTATION THE JUDGMENT DATED 06/07/2021 OF THIS HONOURABLE TRIBUNAL IN LETTER AND SPIRIT.**

.....

**Respectfully Sheweth:**

1. That the appellant/Petitioner filed Service Appeal No. 595/2019 before this Hon' able Tribunal which has been accepted by this Hon' able Tribunal vide Judgment dated 06/07/2021. (Copy of Judgment is annexed as Annexure-A).
2. That non-implementation of the above said Judgment the Petitioner filed execution petition No. **181/2021** in response of which the respondent Department submitted implementation report dated **30/12/2021** whereby the Judgment of this Hon' able tribunal has not been properly implemented to the extent of back benefits in practical shape. (Copy of order sheet dated

2)

07/07/2022 and implementation dated 30.12.2021 are attached as Annexure- B&C).

3. That the Petitioner/appellant visited so many times to Respondent department for his back benefits of service already granted to the appellant by this Hon'able Tribunal in Judgment passed in service appeal No.595/2019 on 06.07.2021 but in vain.
4. That the respondent Department is bound to obey the order of this Hon'able Tribunal properly by treating the Petitioner according to the Judgment passed on 06/07/2021.
5. That the Petitioner has no other option but to file the instant execution petition for properly implementation of the Judgment of this Hon'able Tribunal in letter and spirit.

It is therefore requested that on acceptance of this Petition the respondent Department may kindly be directed to implement the judgment passed by Hon'able Tribunal on 06.07.2021 properly in letter and spirit.

Dated 26/09/2023


  
Appellant/Petitioner

Through


  
Rooeda Khan  
Advocates High Court Peshawar

AFFIDAVIT

I, Muhammad Rehman S/o Amroz Khan (Laboratory Assistant at Government Degree College Al Puri Shangla R/o Faiz Abad Tehsil Al-Puri District Shangla do here by solemnly affirm and declare on oath that all the contents of the above petition are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been misstated or concealed from this Hon'able Tribunal.



DEPONENT

  
15501-6325267-9

1A (3)



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

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Service Tribunal

Diary No. 723

Dated 8/5/19

Service Appeal No. 595/2019

Muhammad Rehman S/o Amroz Khan (Ex-Laboratory Assistant at Government Degree college Agra Malakand) R/o Faiz Abad Tehsil Al Puri District Shangla .....**Appellant**

**VERSUS**

1. Secretary Higher Education Department Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.
2. Director Higher Education Department, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Directorate at Peshawar.

.....**Respondents**

**APPEAL U/S 4 OF KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT, 1974, AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 19/12/2018 OF RESPONDENT NO. 2 VIDE WHICH THE SERVICES OF THE APPELLANT WAS TERMINATED, REMOVED WITH FURTHER ORDER OF RECOVERY OF RS. 4168355/-.**

Filed to-day  
Registrar  
8/5/19

Prayer:-

*On acceptance of the appeal, the impugned office order dated 19/12/2018 whereof by imposing major penalty to the appellant, his services was removed with order of*

**ATTESTED**  
  
EXAMINER  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Service Tribunal  
Peshawar

143

**BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR**

Service Appeal No. 595/2019

Date of Institution ... 08.05.2019  
Date of Decision ... 06.07.2021



Muhammad Rehman S/o Amroz Khan (Ex-Laboratory Assistant at Government Degree College, Agra Malakand) R/o Faiz Abad Tehsil al Puri District Shangla.  
... (Appellant)

VERSUS

Secretary, Higher Education Department to Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and one other. ... (Respondents)

APPELLANT

... In Person

MUHAMMAD RIAZ AHMED PAINDAKHEIL  
Assistant Advocate General

... For Respondents

MR. SALAH-U-DIN

MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

MR. ATIQ UR REHMAN WAZIR

MEMBER (EXECUTIVE)

**JUDGMENT**

**Mr. ATIQ UR REHMAN WAZIR MEMBER (E):-** Brief facts of the case

are that the appellant, while serving as Laboratory Assistant in a Government Degree College was proceeded against on the charges of embezzlement and absence, who ultimately was removed from service vide order dated 03-08-2016. Feeling aggrieved, the appellant filed Service Appeal No. 1230/2015 in this tribunal which was decided on 08-03-2018, re-instating the appellant with directions to the respondents to conduct de-novo proceedings within a period of 120 days. Since the respondents failed to complete the proceedings within the stipulated time period, hence the appellant filed Execution Petition No. 234/2018,

ATTESTED

EXAMINED  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Secretary

which reached its logical conclusion, when, as a result of de-novo proceedings, major penalty of removal from service along with recovery of Rupees 41,68,355/ was imposed upon the appellant, against which appellant filed departmental appeal dated 26-12-2018, which was not responded to within the statutory period, hence the instant service appeal with prayers that the impugned order dated 19-12-2018 may be set aside and the appellant may be re-instated in service with all back benefits..

02. Written reply/comments were submitted by respondents.

03. Arguments heard and record perused.

04. The appellant Pro se argued the case and has contended that respondents deliberately delayed the de-novo proceedings, which compelled the appellant to file execution petition before this Tribunal with prayers that neither re-instatement order was issued in his favor nor he was provided opportunity to participate in the de-novo proceedings; that it was due to filing of the execution petition that the respondents issued his re-instatement order in back date, copy of which was not delivered to him; that the whole de-novo proceedings were undertaken secretly and at his back and he was never informed of such proceedings; that the whole disciplinary proceedings are fake, factitious and are engineered, as neither he was issued any charge sheet/statement of allegation, nor any show cause notice was served upon the appellant. Needless to mention of the personal hearing and opportunity of cross-examination. The appellant argued that the respondents failed to produce a single piece of evidence to show that any correspondence was made by the respondents with the appellant with regard to de-novo proceedings. The appellant added that since the proceedings were not completed within stipulated timeframe, hence such proceedings after expiry of said prescribed period of four months, were void, non-existent and of no

ATTESTED

EXAMINER  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal  
Peshawar

/b)

legal value; that actions of the respondents are based on malafide and the appellant was not treated in accordance with law; that fake record is being generated by two employees of the College namely Mr. Bashir Khan, Deputy Director (Establishment) and Muhammad Iftikhar, Deputy Director (Academic), having personal grudge with the appellant; that such fraudulent act is evident from the fact that no date is affixed on any of the documents, which are purported to be genuine; that such documents were made factitiously only for submission in this Tribunal and no document whatsoever, has been handed over to the appellant nor sent to the appellant via registered mail; that the appellant has already submitted an application to this Tribunal to summon the above mentioned two officials and to take punitive action against them for their fraudulent actions and submission of fake documents in this Court; that these two individuals having personal grudge with the appellant are trying their best to keep him away from his job. The appellant prayed that action of the respondents and particularly the two officials mentioned above are based on malafide and the appellant was not treated in accordance with law and the impugned order having no value in the eyes of law, may be set aside, the appellant may be re-instated in service with all back benefits and recovery of the amount may be set at naught.

05. Learned Assistant Advocate General appearing on behalf of respondents has contended that in pursuance of judgment dated 08-03-2018 of this Tribunal, the appellant was re-instated in service vide order dated 11-05-2018 and an inquiry committee was constituted. Learned Assistant Advocate General contended that the inquiry committee tried its level best to contact the appellant via telephone contact/SMS, but the appellant did not turn up. Learned Assistant Advocate General further contended that the competent authority prepared proper charge sheet/statement of allegation to be served upon the appellant, but the appellant never joined the de-novo proceedings, thus the

**ATTESTED**

EXAMINER  
Kashmir Panchayats  
Service Tribunal  
Srinagar



inquiry committee was left with no option but to proceed the appellant ex-parte. Learned Assistant Advocate General explained that the inquiry committee concluded its proceedings on 30-08-2018 and report was submitted to the competent authority and the competent authority imposed major penalty of removal from service along with recovery of Rs. 41,68,355/ upon the appellant vide order dated 19-12-2018. Learned Assistant Advocate General added that the appellant committed financial embezzlement and FIR No. 3 dated 08-09-2011 u/s 409/419/420/468/471/201/5(2) of PCA has been registered in police station anti-corruption, which is still pending adjudication; that successive inquiries including the instant inquiry held the appellant responsible for embezzlement in collusion with some other officers/officials; that the appellant was rightly proceeded against and the penalty imposed does commensurate with the guilt of the appellant, therefore the appellant does not deserve any mercy, hence his appeal being devoid of merit may be dismissed.

06. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. We have observed that this Tribunal vide its earlier judgment announced on 08-03-2018 in the previous appeal filed by the appellant has observed that the respondents did not adhere to all the procedural steps in the disciplinary proceedings, which were mandatory as per law and rules. It was further observed that the impugned order of removal from service in respect of the appellant was made only on the ground of absence and there was no findings regarding the charge of embezzlement. With such observations, the appellant was re-instated in service with direction to the respondents to conduct de-novo proceedings regarding both the charges (absence and embezzlement) within a period of 120 days in accordance with law, which clearly manifests that the respondents had not charged the appellant on the issue of embezzlement in the initial proceedings, which point is meaningful. As is evident from the execution petition filed by the

ATTESTED

EXAMINER  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal  
Peshawar

appellant on 17-07-2018, the respondents failed to comply with the orders of this Tribunal to complete de-novo proceedings until filing of the execution petition by the appellant with prayers that neither the appellant was re-instated in service till date nor he was associated with the de-novo proceedings. File pertaining to the execution petition in respect of the appellant reveals that implementation report, containing the impugned order dated 19-12-2018 surfaced vide order sheet dated 02-04-2019, much later than expiry of the stipulated timeframe, which creates doubts about credibility of his re-instatement order purportedly issued on 11-05-2018, which too was not made in an official format. We have also found two copies of re-instatement order, one submitted by the appellant and another by respondents. The former without signature and the later signed by deputy director (academic), which have made the issue more suspicious. Annexed thereto was copy of charge sheet/statement of allegation and copy of an inquiry report. The charge sheet/statement of allegation issued so far, are without any date, whereas the inquiry report is shown as finalized on 31-08-2018, later than the stipulated timeframe fixed by this Tribunal, but no show cause notice was found annexed with the implementation report. To this effect the apex court vide its judgment reported in 2007 PLC (CS) 959 has held that non implementation of judgment of Service Tribunal within the stipulated timeframe and its implementation after expiry of the timeframe would be void, non-existent and of no legal value. Needless to mention that the inquiry so conducted is replete with deficiencies as previous stories of departmental inquiries have been repeated. The inquiry report is re-composition of the earlier inquiries conducted by Anti-corruption establishment and another inquiry conducted by an inquiry committee headed by Prof Munsif Khan. Such reliance on previous inquiries is stated to be made due to the reason that record pertaining to account office, college record and bank record was not made available to the committee and the committee

**ATTESTED**

EXAMINER  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal  
Peshawar

91

was obligated to rely on the available record in shape of inquiry reports, which shows that the inquiry committee had not unfold the real story, rather made a copy paste option only to the extent of generating a report for the eye wash of high-ups. Contents of the inquiry report reveals that the appellant was contacted on phone and SMS and to this effect, two letters dated 04-07-2018 and 20-07-2018 are also available on record, addressed to the appellant at his college address, knowing the fact that the appellant was no more on the college roll, which however was required to be sent to the appellant at his home address via registered acknowledgment mail. We have noted that the inquiry officer failed to prove the allegations with cogent reasons and to substantiate his findings with solid evidence, needless to mention that the appellant was kept deprived of personal hearing and opportunity to cross examine witnesses, rather the inquiry committee mainly relied on previous inquiries. Recommendation part of the inquiry report is reproduced as under:

*"On the basis of above, it is recommended that since the charges against Mr. Muhammad Rehman have been proved in different independent inquiries, so competent authority may impose major penalty. It is further recommended that the losses accrued to the government exchequer/employees of the college and GDC Agra etc after 2004 till date due to Muhammad Rehman may be recovered from him along with interest and the recommendations of Prof Munsif Khan Inquiry be implemented."*

Report of the inquiry committee headed by Prof Munsif Khan was also perused, which committee was constituted on the request of Prof Fazli Wahid Ex-Principal for release of his commutation and pension, which were withheld due to initiation of disciplinary proceedings against him, as he was also a co-accused in this case. The committee recommended release of his pension and commutation as well as recommended recovery of the embezzled amount from almost eleven officers/official including the appellant. Record also reveals that recoveries has been affected to the tune of Rs. 1,480,170/ from Prof Fazli Wahid Ex-Principal, Prof. Zia ul Haq, Ex-Principal and Prof. Fazli Ghafoor Ex-Principal, who were also

ATTESTED

EXAMINER  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal  
Peshawar

accused in this case. It is worth to mention that since the inquiry committee was under obligation due to judgment of this Tribunal to probe into the issue of embezzlement in respect of the appellant, hence the committee was required to investigate the issue on scientific lines, as alleged impersonated signature of the appellant can only be verified by Forensic Science Laboratory, which however was not done by the inquiry committee. The respondents also failed to establish as to how the appellant being a Laboratory Assistant was entrusted with the job of Account Clerk. We did not find any order in written to show that such responsibility was assigned to the appellant. Needless to mention that the appellant was neither drawing & disbursing officer, nor was supposed to perform duty as an account clerk. It was also noted that recoveries have been affected from Ex-Principals of the college, who were actually drawing & disbursing officers and mainly responsible for monetary dispensation, hence making the appellant solely responsible for embezzlement and making recoveries from the Ex-DDOs are contradictory and which have made the whole proceedings dubious.

07. Presumably, if stance of the inquiry officer is acknowledged that the appellant after re-instatement remained absent and did not participate in the de-novo proceedings, in that case, the respondent were required to initiate proceedings against the appellant under Rule 9 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Government Servants (Efficiency & Discipline) Rules, 2011, but which was not done and the respondents continued its proceedings under Rule 11 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Government Servants (Efficiency & Discipline) Rules, 2011, and after submission of the inquiry report to the competent authority, the competent authority skipped rule 14(4) of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Government Servants (Efficiency & Discipline) Rules, 2011, and directly issued his removal from service order. Record also reveals that an FIR dated 08-09-2011 was also registered against the appellant in Police Station Anti-corruption establishment, which is still

**ATTESTED**

EXAMINER

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal

Peshawar

pending adjudication. It was also noted that the respondents submitted piecemeal documents from time to time to this Tribunal and to this effect, show cause notice undated in respect of the appellant, which was not submitted with the implementation report in execution petition, was submitted at a very belated stage, which strengthen the contention of the appellant, that the respondents prepare fake orders and submit to the Tribunal from time to time. The question of recovery of embezzled amount was thoroughly examined, but the inquiry report substantiated its stance with findings of the previous inquiries and did not offer a solid evidence to this effect.

08. Stance of the appellant, on the other hand is also worth consideration, as if the respondents had issued his re-instatement order well within time and if he was proceeded against within the statutory period, he would have not filed execution petition before this Tribunal after expiry of the statutory period. It is crystal clear that copies of such proceedings were presented before this Court after lapse of almost one year.

09. In view of the foregoing, we are of the considered opinion that the appellant was proceeded against twice, but was not treated in accordance with law. We smacks malafide on part of the respondents to the effect that the appellant was kept ignorant of the de-novo proceedings so much so that his re-instatement order for the purpose of de-novo inquiry was presented to this Tribunal with delay of nine month after expiry of the timeframe fixed for de-novo proceedings. The proceedings so conducted are replete with deficiencies having no value in the eyes of law and are liable to be struck down.

10. In the light of the above discussion, the instant appeal is accepted and the appellant is re-instated in service with all back benefits. The respondents shall, however be at liberty to conduct de-novo inquiry into the matter regarding


**ATTESTED**

EXAMINER  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal  
Peshawar

(12)

the alleged embezzlement, if they so desires. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to record room.

**ANNOUNCED**  
**06.07.2021**



**(SALAH-U-DIN)**  
**MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**



**(ATIQ UR REHMAN WAZIR)**  
**MEMBER (EXECUTIVE)**

**Certified to be true copy**

**EXAMINER**  
**Khyber Pakhtunkhwa**  
**Service Tribunal,**  
**Peshawar**

Date of Presentation of Application	6-9-21
Number of Words	4900
Copying fee	26-
Urgent	u-
Total	50
Name of Copyiest	
Date of Completion of Copy	6-9-21
Date of Delivery of Copy	6-9-21

# بعدالت جناب چیئرمین صاحب سروس ٹریبیونل خیبر پختونخوا پشاور


اجراء نمبر: 181

توہین عدالت:

محمد رحمان ولد امرو ز خان لیبارٹری اسٹنٹ گورنمنٹ ڈگری کالج خوازہ حیلہ سوات مستقل ایڈریس محلہ فیض آباد گاؤں ڈاکخانہ تحصیل پورنی ضلع شانگلہ

بنام

- (۱) ڈائریکٹر ہائیر ایجوکیشن خیبر پختونخوا پشاور
- (۲) محمد نعیم خان پرنسپل گورنمنٹ ڈگری کالج آگرہ مالا کنڈا بجنسی ٹ



عنوان: درخواست برائے اجراء توہین عدالت کی کارروائی برائے اپیل نمبر 595/19 اور حکم عدالت حضور مورخہ 6/07/2021 اور ڈائریکٹر ہائیر ایجوکیشن خیبر پختونخوا پشاور کے آرڈر مورخہ 26/08/2021 پر کارروائی کرنے کا استدعا۔



مودبانہ گزارش ہے کہ سائل آپ حضور کے خدمت میں درج ذیل عرض رساں ہے۔


- (۱) یہ کہ سائل نے عدالت حضور میں سروس اپیل نمبر 595/19 مورخہ 08-05-2019 کو دائر کیا تھا۔
- (۲) یہ کہ سائل کے اپیل نمبر 595/2019 مورخہ 08/05/2019 کو عدالت حضور نے مورخہ 06-07-2021 پر منظور کر کے سائل کو تمام بقایات جات کے ساتھ سروس پر بحال کیا ہے۔
- (۳) یہ کہ سائل کے اپیل نمبر 595/2019 مورخہ 08/05/2019 پر عدالت حضور کے حکم مورخہ 06-07-2021 پر ڈائریکٹر ہائیر ایجوکیشن خیبر پختونخوا پشاور نے عدالت حضور کی حکم کی تعمیل کر کے سائل کو مورخہ 26/08/2021 پر سروس پر بحال کر کے گورنمنٹ ڈگری کالج خوازہ حیلہ سوات میں تعینات کیا ہے۔ (آرڈر کی فوٹو کاپی لف ہے)۔
- (۴) یہ کہ سائل نے ڈائریکٹر ہائیر ایجوکیشن خیبر پختونخوا پشاور کے آرڈر مورخہ 26/08/2021 پر مورخہ 31/08/2021 پر گورنمنٹ ڈگری کالج خوازہ حیلہ سوات میں چارج لیا ہے۔ اور ڈیوٹی شروع کی ہے (چارج رپورٹ کی کاپی لف ہے)۔
- (۵) یہ کہ سائل کو چارج لینے اور ڈیوٹی شروع کرنے کے بعد قانون اور رولز کے مطابق سائل کی تنخواہ جاری کرنے کی ضرورت ہے۔ اور سروس ٹریبونل خیبر پختونخوا پشاور کے حکم مورخہ 06-07-2021 پر سائل کو تمام بقایا جات کے ساتھ سروس پر بحال کرنے کا حکم دیا ہے۔ تو سائل کی بقایا جات میں سائل کی سب کچھ شامل ہے۔ یعنی بانی تنخواہیں پر دوشن وغیرہ تو سروس ٹریبونل خیبر پختونخوا کے حکم کی مزید کارروائی کرنے کے لیے اور سائل کی موجودہ تنخواہ جاری کرنے کے لیے سائل کی سروس بک کو مکمل کرنا اور سائل کو LPC کو سابقہ کالج سے درکار ہے۔ لیکن ڈائریکٹر ہائیر ایجوکیشن خیبر پختونخوا پشاور کے آرڈر مورخہ 26/08/2021 ہونے کے باوجود ابھی تک سائل کو سروس بک مکمل نہیں کیا گیا ہے۔ اور نہ ہی سائل کو LPC Issue کیا ہے۔ جس کی وجہ سے سروس ٹریبونل خیبر پختونخوا پشاور کے حکم مورخہ 06-07-2021 اور ڈائریکٹر ہائیر ایجوکیشن خیبر پختونخوا پشاور کے آرڈر مورخہ 26-08-2021 کی تعمیل نہیں ہوا ہے۔ اور اسی وجہ پر مزید کارروائی بھی نہیں ہو رہا ہے۔

certified to be true copy

EXAMINER  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa  
Service Tribunal  
Peshawar

سائل کی سروس بک کو مکمل کرنا اور LPC کو Issue کرنا پرنسپل گورنمنٹ ڈگری کالج آگرہ مالا کنڈا بجنسی کی ذمہ داری ہے۔ لیکن محمد نعیم خان پرنسپل ایک سازش اور ذلت کی بنیاد پر سائل کو نہ سروس بک مکمل کرتا ہے اور نہ ہی LPC لیشو کرتا ہے۔ حالانکہ ڈائریکٹر ہائیر ایجوکیشن خیبر پختونخوا پشاور کے آرڈر مورخہ 26/08/2021


1147



22

07.07.2022


Petitioner present in person. Mr. Noor Zaman Khattak, District Attorney alongwith Fazal Hadi, Associate Professor for respondents present




Representative of the respondent department submitted Office Order Endst: No. 31357-63 CA-VII/Estt: Branch /A-167/GDC Agra dated 30.12.2021 through which petitioner had been reinstated in service with all back benefits, and posted him against the vacant post of GDC Khwaza Khela Swat with immediate effect. Hence Judgement of Service Tribunal stands implemented.

In view of the above, instant petition is disposed off. File be consigned to record room.

Announced.  
07.07.2022

  
(Farzana Paul)  
Member (E)  
Camp Court, Swat

Date of Presentation: 07/03/23  
 Number of Pages: 2  
 Copying Fee: 10/-  
 Urgent: 5/-  
 Total: 15/-  
 Name of: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date of Collection: 07/03/23  
 Date of Disposal: 07/03/23

Certified to be true copy  




100 (15)

TO BE SUBSTITUTED BEARING OFFICE ORDER Endst. No 18168-74 DATED 26-08-2021  
LIGHT OF SERVICE TRIBUNAL ORDER DATED 06-07-2021 IN SERVICE APPEAL  
NO. 595/2019



**DIRECTORATE OF HIGHER EDUCATION**  
**KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA**  
**RANO GHARI NEAR CHAMKANI MOR, PESHAWAR**

E-mail:- [dhekpesh@gmail.com](mailto:dhekpesh@gmail.com) Facebook.com/dhekpeshawar Twitter.com/dhekpeshawar1

Dated Peshawar the 30 / 12 /2021

**OFFICE ORDER:**


In pursuance of the judgment passed by Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Service Tribunal, Peshawar on 06-07-2021 in Service Appeal No. 595/2019, the Competent Authority is pleased to reinstate the services of Muhammad Rahman, Lab Assistant with all back benefits, and post him against the vacant post at Govt: Degree College, Khwaza Khela (Swat) with immediate effect.

**DIRECTOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Endst. No. 3/357-63/CA-VII/Estt: Branch/A-167/GDC Agra


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

1. Registrar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Service Tribunal, Peshawar.
2. Principal, Govt: Degree College, Agra (Malakand).
3. Principal, Govt: Degree College, Khwaza Khela (Swat).
4. District Account Officer, Malakand.
5. District Account Officer, Swat.
6. PA to Director, Higher Education Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar.
7. Official concerned.

  
(Khawaja M. Saqib)

**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (GENERAL)**

بعدالت کتاب سے طر اسلوب نامہ



مورخہ

مقدمہ

دعویٰ

جرم

۲۰۰۲ء منجانب سائل / السلام

محمد ہانی نام الحاکم

### باعث تحریر آنکہ

مقدمہ مندرجہ عنوان بالا میں اپنی طرف سے واسطے پیروی و جواب دہی وکل کارروائی متعلقہ

کیلئے لکھنے کے لئے

مقرر کر کے اقرار کیا جاتا ہے۔ کہ صاحب موصوف کو مقدمہ کی کل کارروائی کا کامل اختیار ہوگا۔ نیز وکیل صاحب کو راضی نامہ کرنے ق تقرر ثالث و فیصلہ پر حلف دیئے جواب دہی اور اقبال دعویٰ اور بصورت ڈگری کرنے اجراء اور وصولی چیک و روپیہ از عرضی دعویٰ اور درخواست ہر قسم کی تصدیق زرائیں پر دستخط کرانے کا اختیار ہوگا۔ نیز صورت عدم پیروی یا ڈگری یکطرفہ یا اپیل کی برآمدگی اور منسوخی نیز دائر کرنے اپیل نگرانی و نظر ثانی و پیروی کرنے کا محتاج ہوگا۔ از بصورت ضرورت مقدمہ مذکور کے قس یا جزوی کارروائی 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 مذکور با اختیارات حاصل ہوں گے اور اس کا ساختہ پر داختم منظور و قبول ہوگا دوران مقدمہ میں جو خرچہ ہر جانہ التوائے مقدمہ ہوں گے سبب سے وہوگا۔ 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 لکھ دیا کہ سند ہے۔

۲۰

ماہ

المرقوم

العبد گاہ العبد

Accept  
R