Form- A FORM OF ORDER SHEET

	* **	
Court of		
	· · ·	*
Implementation	Potition No.	118/2024

	•	Court of
		Implementation Petition No. 118/2024
S.No ·	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1	31.01.202	The implementation petition of Mr. Sardar Ali
-		submitted today by Mr. Muhammad Asif Advocate. It is
	4	fixed for implementation report before Single Bench at
	•	Peshawar on Original file be
		requisitioned. AAG has noted the next date. Parcha Peshi
		is given to the counsel for the petitioner.
		By the order of Chair man
		RZGISYKAR

<u>BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, SERVICE TRIBUNAL,</u> PESHAWAR

E.P. NO.118/2024

Application (Execution No.26/2024)
In
S.A.No.60/2018

Sardar Ali	Petitioner
7	Versus
Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (K.I	P) through Chief Secretary and others
	Respondents

INDEX

S.No.	Description of documents.	Annex:	Pages.
1.	Application for implementation.		1-3
- 2.	Affidavit.		4
3.	Copy of judgment dated 28.09.2020	A	5-11
4.	Copy of the Execution Petition No.26/2021 in Appeal No.60/2018	В	12-13
5.	Copy of notification No.SOE (AD)21-226 Sardar Ali/490 dated 28.03.2022	С	14
6.	Copy of order of the Hon'ble Tribunal dated 09.06.2022	D	15
7.	Wakalatnama		16

Dated: 30.01.2023

Applicant

Through &

Muhammad Asif

Advocate

Supreme Court of Pakistan

Off: 214 Syed Ahmad Ali Building near Taj Autos, Sunehri

Masjid Road, Peshawar Cantt.

Cell: 0332-8885187

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, SERVICE TRIBUNAL. PESHAWAR.



E.P. NO.118/2024

Service Tribunal
Diary No. 10915

Application (Execution No.26/202♣)
In
S.A.No.60/2018

- 1) Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (K.P) through Chief Secretary, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar.

APPLICATION FOR **ISSUANCE OF** DIRECTIONS TO THE RESPONDENTS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JUDGMENT PASSED BYTHE HON'BLE **KHYBER** PAKHTUNKHWA (K.P) SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR ON 28.09.2020 IN LETTER AND SPIRIT AND PROMOTE THE APPELLANT FROM DUE DATE 11.07.2016 WHEN JUNIOR WAS PROMOTED WITH **ALL BACK** BENEFITS.

Respectfully Sheweth;

The applicant begs to make the following submissions:

- 1) That the applicant has performed his services as District Agriculture in Extension Wing till his retirement to the entire satisfaction of this superiors.
- 2) That unluckily it was 2016 when the department initiated departmental proceedings against the applicant and others. The



competent authority vide order No.SOE (AD)/21-226//0/Sardar Ali dated 06.09.2017 to the extent of the applicant, imposed minor penalty of "withholding of promotion for two years as well as withholding of two increments for two years"

- 3) That the review petition filed by the applicant on 16.10.2017 was not acceded to.
- The applicant then assailed the said order before the Hon'ble Service
 Tribunal, Peshawar (The Tribunal) in his Service Appeal
 No.80/2018.
- 5) That the Hon'ble Tribunal in its judgment pronounced on 28.09.2020 allowed the service appeal of the applicant partially and held in operative part of the judgment as thus:

"The upshot of what has been discussed in the foregoing paras the appeal of the applicant is partially accepted and the impugned orders dated 06.09.2017 and 20.12.2018 are modified to the extent that the minor penalty of withholding of promotion for two years as well as withholding of two increments and converted into minor penalty of "censure" with all back benefits".

(The copy of judgment dated 28.09.2020 is Annexure "A").

That the applicant then filed an application/ Execution Petition No.26/2021 in appeal No.60/2018 for the execution/ implementation of the aforesaid judgment.

(Copy of the execution petition No.26/2021 in appeal No.60/2018 is Annexure "B").

7) That the representative of the respondents during the pendency of the said application submitted a Notification No.SOE(AD)/21-226/80 Sardar Ali/ 490 dated 28.03.2022 by stating misleadingly that the respondent department implemented the judgment of the Hon'ble Tribunal conditionally subject to C.P.L.A.

(Copy of the notification No.SOE(AD)21-226/80 Sardar Ali/ 490 dated 28.03.2022 is Annexure "C").

(3)

That the hon'ble Service Tribunal then disposed of the application of the applicant filed by him for the implementation of the aforesaid judgment by its order dated 09.06.2022.

(Copy of the order of the Hon'ble Tribunal dated 09.06.2022 is Annexure "D").

9) That the respondents were under obligation to implement the judgment dated 28.09.2020 of the Hon'ble Tribunal in its true essence by allowing him promotion to BPS-19 with all back benefits etc. as ordered by the Tribunal. The notification produced in the Hon'ble Tribunal in any way cannot outstrip or take the place of the legal findings in the judgment of the Hon'ble Tribunal.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that on acceptance of this application, the respondents may please be directed, in the best interest of justice to implement the judgment dated 28.09.2020 of this Hon'ble Tribunal in its true sprit by promoting the applicant to BPS-19 from due date when junior was promoted with all back benefits.

Applican

Through

Muhammad Asif

Advocate

Supreme Court of Pakistan

Off: 214 Syed Ahmad Ali Building near Taj Autos, Sunehri

Masjid Road, Peshawar Cantt.

Cell: 0332-8885187

4

<u>BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, SERVICE TRIBUNAL.</u> <u>PESHAWAR.</u>

Application (Execution No.26/2024) In S.A.No.60/2018

Sardar Ali	Petitioner
Versus	t
Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (K.P) through Chief Secre	etary and others.
	Respondent

AFFIDAVIT

I, Sardar Ali son of Ajmal Khan R/o Al-Waris City Bannu Road, Opposite Election Office, D.I.Khan do hereby affirm and declare on oath that the contents of the accompanying **Application** are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Hon'ble Tribunal

ATTESTED

AND Oaraz Arrange

And

Deponent CNIC No. 122 01-7535689-5

lunex H

THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Service Appeal No. 60 /2018

Sardar Ali

District Director

Agriculture Extension, District Tank

isaud;

Versus

1. The Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Chief Secretary,

Civil Secretariat, Peshawar.

vice Tribunal

.Appellant

2. The Secretary

> to Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Agriculture Department,

SERVICE APPEAL UNDER SECTION **OF** THE **KHYBER** PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1974 AGAINST THE IMPUGNED ORIGIONAL ORDER DATED 06.09.2017 ENDORSED ON 18.09.2017 WHEREBY THE APPELLANT WAS AWARDED MINOR PENALTY OF WITHHOLDING OF PROMOTION FOR TWO YEARS AS WELL AS WITHHOLDING OF TWO INCREMENTS FOR TWO YEARS AGAINST WHICH APPELLANT FILED REVIEW PETITION ON 16.10.2017 BEFORE THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY WHICH WAS UNLAWFULLY REGRETTED VIDE IMPUGNED APPELLATE ORDER DATED 20.12.2017 WHICH WAS COMMUNICATED TO APPELLANT QN 05.01.2018.

egistrar

PRAYER:

On acceptance of the instant appeal, the impugned original order dated 06.09.2017 and the impugned appellate order dated 20.12.2018 may graciously be brushed aside and the penalty imposed upon appellant be withdrawn with all back benefits. ATTESTED

> Pakhtunkhwa vice Tribunal. Peshawar



BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR.

Service Appeal No. 60/2018

Date of Institution ...

... 16.01.2018

Date of Decision

... 28.09.2020



Sardar Ali, District Director Agriculture Extension, District Tank

... (Appellant)

VERSUS

The Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Chief Secretary, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar and another.

(Respondents)

Mr. KHALED RAHMAN,

Advocate

For appellant.

MR. RIAZ AHMAD PAINDAKHEIL, Assistant Advocate General

For respondents. Peshawar

Service Filografi

Khyber Foking

TESTED

MUHAMMAD JAMAL KHAN MIAN MUHAMMAD ---

MEMBER (Judicial)
MEMBER (Executive)

JUDGMENT:

ATTESTEL

MUHAMMAD JAMAL KHAN, MEMBER:- Through the instant Service Appeal submitted under Section-4 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Services Tribunal Act, 1974, varies of impugned order dated 06.09.2017 passed by Chief Minister Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, appellant was awarded minor penalty of withholding of promotion for two years conjointly helding in abeyance two increments for two years, filing of petition for review on 16.10.2017 which did not materialize calling in question the order so passed by the appellate authority dated 20.12.2017.

2. While acting as District Director Agriculture Tank he was served with charge sheet and statement of allegations vide letter dated 23.03.2016, four charges were leveled against the appellant followed by an irregular inquiry being conducted in a cursory



manner serving him with a questionnaire which was responded. The inquiry officer in his respective inquiry report submitted that two charges were partially proved resulting into recommending minor penalty while the rest of the charges were not proved. He was served with show-cause notice vide letter dated 13.03.2017 wherein major penalty of removal from service was proposed. Appellant responded the show-cause notice explaining his position once again and requesting the authority for providing a chance of personal hearing. While explaining his position during the course of personal hearing the authority found the appellant innocent but by virtue of order dated 06.09.2017 endorsed on 18.09.2017 double punishment was imposed followed by departmental appeal however, the same did not yield vide letter dated 20.12.2017 communicated on 05.01.2018.

Respondents were summoned and on attendance they submitted reply controverting the claim of appellant by raising of various objections of legal and factual nature such as no locus standi, maintainability, cause of action, concealment of material facts etc.

We have heard arguments of the learned representing appellant and also heard the Assistant Advocate Géneral and gone through record with their valuable assistance in view of which our findings are recorded in the following paras.

Learned counsel for the appellant while strenuously arguing submitted that no regular inquiry as per the mandate of law was nor the authority adhered to tenets and cannon of conducted get recording statement of appellant nor by documentary evidence was taken into possession in full view of appellant nor he was provided with any opportunity of crossexamination thus the penalty so imposed has not sanctity in the eyes of law as there is no legal sanction behind such a whimsical order. The learned counsel added that during the course of personal hearing appellant has rightly explained all his position to the authority who found the appellant innocent but even then he was awarded double punishment, that such an act is violation of Article-4 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan 1973 that earlier a four members inquiry committee investigated into the matter and they found the performance of the appellant satisfactory rather he was appreciated. He continued that District Tank is a big wheat producing district having an estimated arable land of 9225 Hectors during the year 2014-15, that due to completion of Gomal Zam Dam Project and availability of water

resources more cultivatable area in District Tank came under the command of water canals and according to the Crop Reporting Services Khyber Pakhtunkhwa the Wheat cultivated area increased to 14095 Hectors therefore, the demand was made according to the real requirement of the District which was incorporated in revised PC-1. The increase and decrease in demand was not restricted to District Tank alone but it was for all the Districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The salient objective of the project was to overcome the Wheat grains deficiency by growing sufficient wheat Crop for availability of the wheat requirements to the province. Initially land holding criteria of 1-5 Acres was specified through a summery moved to the Chief Minster, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa however, the P&D department on the same summery reduced it to 1-3 Acres. It was observed by the Agriculture Department on the same summery that the size of land data 1-3 Acres is neither available with the Agriculture Extensions Department nor with the Bureau of Statistic and for availability of correct figures a time span of one year was required for multi faceted enterprise. A bulging issue surfaced that during the enforcement of the project with respect to District Kohistan, Torghar, Chitral, Dir (Lower) and Dir (Upper) where the land has not been settled by the Revenue Department which was highlighted during the course of meeting held on 02.10.2015, that there was no immediate solution to implement the land holding criteria exactly as PC-1 in these districts however, the issue was temporarily resolved by asking Deputy Commissioners and District Nazims to cooperate and settle the same at the spot. When the implementation of the project commenced it was observed that in District Tank size of three acres of arable wheat growth area did not exist. This fact was brought into the notice of high-ups which resulted into an increase in the size of land to 1-12.5 acres in a meeting dated 02.10.2015 and the farmers having the aforesaid cultivated area were held entitled to apply for the supply of free seed instead of original limit of 1.3 acres and so the appellant acted according to the instructions. In a PDWP meeting held on 13.10.2015 it was decided that land holding of the farmers possessing 1-12.5 acres will be studied by the department as initially the land holding limit was set for 1-3 acres of approximate beneficiaries 326000/- but that was not communicated to the field offices which has been highlighted in the minutes of the meeting held in the office of Deputy Commissioner D.I.Khan on 03.11.2015 wherein it was reiterated that farmers having 8 canals minimum and maximum of

100 canals of Agriculture land is entitled for the program. In the

whole scenario neither criteria of the project nor other instructions whatsoever including copy of PC-1 was circulated to any field Department Repetitive request of Agriculture confirmed that instructions have been circulated verbally and confined to meetings and nothing was reduced into writing. Since the criteria was not viable sans any pragmatic approach that government modified the criteria for the second year in the PDWP meeting held on 04.10.2016 by increasing the land holding to 1-12.5 acres for the second year of the project and while concurring with this strong notion, the allegations leveled were partially dropped by the inquiry officer. As regards allegation no. 3rd the requisite criteria was fulfilled by conforming to the requirements set by the department, the applications moved were duly signed by the Kissan Counselor, Halga Patwari bearing their seal of verification of the set of the owners or cultivating occupants and in turn verified by the Gardawar Circle and no anomaly was found. That while keeping all these facts in view since the charges were leveled without any substance therefore, appellant should have been exonerated but he was awarded penalty which is not. sustainable in the eyes of law.

On the other hand, the learned Assistant Advocate General for the respondents submitted that the government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Launched three years program titled "Insaf Food Security Program" according to which small farmers were held entitled to be supplied wheat seed free of cost to ensure food security in the province. The scheme was successful and the beneficiaries were provided certified wheat seed. The efforts so made were lauded throughout the province except for complaint of violating criteria, management and abuse of power in District Tank. The matter was probed by the Provincial Inspection Team and monitoring wing of Planning and Development Department and the Agriculture Department constituted internal inquiry team which submitted its report, the executing authority of the project submitted monitoring report pointing to certain irregularities and biotin violation of the prescribed procedure. The criteria given in PC-1 has not been followed and the seed was distributed to non deserving farmers in violation thereof particularly land holding ILS criteria for selection of beneficiaries i.e cultivated land of 1-3 Acres as per approved PC-1 draft was infringed. Appellant demanded 16000 bags of certified wheat seed from Director General Agriculture Extension Khyber Pakhtunkhwa for free distribution under "Insaf Food Security Program" which was much higher of original demand of 5600 bags. A show-cause notice was issued

(10)

vide letter dated 13.03.2017 wherein a major penalty of removal from service was proposed however, after personal hearing the competent authority in the light of charges and evidence on record, the explanation of appellant, minor penalty was imposed. Review filed in this regard was not entertained having no merits under Rule-17 (2) (a) of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Government Servants (Efficiency & Discipline) Rules, 2011. The disciplinary proceedings rightly culminated into awarding of subject punishment.

In the light of lengthy arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the appellant and learned Assistant Advocate General and the available record on file abundantly clarified the fact that original demand for the supply of certified seed to the farmers as per PC-1 was 5600 bags of wheat as per criteria of 1-3 acres of land holders or cultivators of land which was enhanced and aco demand for retrieval of 16000 bags was made under compelling circumstances. An officer holding responsible post as in the case. of appellant ordinarily cannot on his own initiative, venture on at dare devil undertaking of the kind in hand unless and until the involvement or consequent intervention of the higher-ups is made which is reflected in the inquiry report where reference to the involvement of the higher authority have been given eminently. Although the findings so made are not based on any documentary the extraction of which would ordinarily be an uphill task for a civil servant however, credibility has to be attached to a unimpeached and unsullied notion of Nevertheless, while sticking to the principles despite exertion of pressure is not the handiwork of each and every official and is a hall mark of principled individual of outstanding stature. If the pleas of the appellant are parallely put in juxtaposition with the ground realities there was exorbitant increase in the cultivated land in District Tank particularly on the successful completion of the Gomal Zam Dam Project, which of course considerably increased the area of cultivated and arable land coming under its command. Furthermore, the difference between demand and, actual requirement would reveal that before fixing of limit of the arable area and the quantity of wheat required a thorough survey or exploration of the area was not conducted nor serious endeavors in this regard were under taken therefore, variation in this regard was inevitable and natural phenomenon. Again enhancement in area from the limit of 1-3 acres to 1-12.5 acres for the wheat growers on the demand of higher-ups has changed the entire scenario putting the official in doldrum. An inevitable

corollary of the findings of inquiry officer with regard to the last two charges reveals that appellant exerted his level best to come up to the expectation for fulfilling the requirements set but due to the enhancement of area by the higher-ups he could not observe the specified limit. The higher-ups must have been informed of the ground realities and the ground work required for reaching to a correct estimation of the number of cultivators of land vis-à-vis respective land holding limits but nothing of the sort was done. To elaborate again the inquiry report speaks volume of the facts that the entire variation of supply of bags of wheat and area was due to the intervention of the higher-ups and it is not the sole handiwork of appellant alone. Holding single handedly an official and exonerating others without making them accountable is not the norms of justice. It is of course in the light of all these factors reinforced by the ground realities that the inquiry officer reached to the irresistible conclusion that two of the charges in this regard were stated to be partially proved while the rest of the two allegations/charges did not prove and that were outrightly dropped. Pragmatically and virtually the appellant was made a scapegoat for the direly needed altar for sacrifice. The penalties thus imposed do not seem compatible or commensurate with the quantum of guilt, we thus hold that the punishment awarded to the civil servant was harsh which is liable to modification and conversion.

8. The upshot of what has been discussed in the foregoing paras the appeal of the appellant is partially accepted and the impugned orders dated 06.09.2017 and 20.12.2018 are modified to the extent that the minor penalty of withholding of promotion for two years as well as withholding of two increments and converted into minor penalty of "censure" with all back benefits. Parties are left to bear their own costs. File be consigned to the record room.

ANNOUNCED 28.09.2020

ture copy

(MIAN MUHAMMAD) Member (Executive) (MUHAMMAD JAMAL KHAN) Member (Judicial)

member (Judician)

manual descention of Anotherine 27/10/202

manual of Words 2-800

Copylin For Son Co

34.00

the officers of 27

Date of Deliver 27/10/2020

Peshagaran.

Annex B

<u>BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL.</u>

PESHAWAR.

Execution No. ____/2021 In Appeal No.60/2018 Perhawar * Perhawar *

Sardar Ali, Ex-District Director, Agriculture Extension, District Tank.....

..... Appellant

Versus

- 1) Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Chief Secretary, Civil Secretariat, Peshawar.

Application for a direction to respondents to implement the decision of this Hon'ble Tribunal dated 28.09.2020 in its letter and spirit.

Respectfully Sheweth;
Petitioner submits as under:

- 1) That petitioner was serving as District Director in the respondentdepartment.
- 2) That vide order dated 06.09.2017 passed by Chief Minister, KPK, petitioner was awarded minor penalties of withholding of promotion for two years as well as withholding of two increments.
- That petitioner on 16.10.2017 filed review petition which was not accepted on 20.12.2017.
- 4) That petitioner filed an appeal before this Hon'ble Tribunal in which notice was issued to respondents.
- 5) That respondents appeared and filed the reply. However, after hearing the arguments the following orders were passed

"the upshot of what has been discussed in the foregoing paras the appeal of the appellant is partially

Certified to be ture copy

Khrber Fakhtunkhwe Service Tribunal

accepted and the impugned orders dated 06.09.2017 and 20.12.2018 are modified to the extent that the minor penalty of withholding of promotion for two years as well as withholding of two increments and converted into minor penalty of "censure" with all back benefits.

(Photocopy of the decision is Annexure "A").

- That petitioner on 24.11.2020 moved an application to respondents 6) for the implementation of the decision of this Hon'ble Tribunal. (Photocopy of the application is Annexure "B")
- That more than 42 days have been passed but uptil now the 7) respondents have not implemented the decision rather has orally refused to implement the same.

It is, therefore, requested that directions may kindly be issued to respondents for the implementation of the decision dated 28.09.2020 passed by this Hon'ble Tribunal.

Through

PUBLIC

MAR HIGH

Muhammad Asif

Advocate,

Supreme Court of Pakistan

214 Syed Ahmad Ali Building near Taj Autos, Sunehri Masjid

Road, Peshawar Cantt.

Cell: 0302-8885187

Off: 091-5279292

<u>AFFIDAVIT</u>

I, do hereby affirm and declare as instructed by my client that the contents of the Application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Hon'ble Tribùnal. 13/M

Service Tribunal

Peshawar

Acamaras

inex-M



GOVERNMENT OF KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA AGRICULTURE LIVESTOCK FISHERIES & COOPERATIVE DEPARTMENT

Dated Peshawar, the 28th March, 2022

NOTIFICATION

In light of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Service NO. SOE(AD)21-226/80/Sardar Ali: 490 Tribunal, Peshawar Judgment dated 28.09.2020 and in supersession of this Department's notification dated 06.09.2017, the Competent Authority is pleased to convert the minor penalty of "withholding of promotion for two years as well as withholding of two increment" into "CENSURE" subject to the decision of CPLA filed by the Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, in respect of Mr. Sardar Ali, Ex-District Director Agriculture (BS-18), Tank.

SECRETARY AGRÌCULTURE

Endst, of Even No. & Date:

Copy forwarded for information and necessary action to:

1. The Director General, Agriculture (Extension), Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.

2. The District Accounts Officer, Tank.

3. P.S to Chief Secretary, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

4. P.S to Secretary Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries & Cooperative Department, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.

Officer concerned.

Master File.

SECTION OF AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

SUPERITER EUT AGRICUI TINE IE VIENSIONI MYBER PUKHTUNANWA PESHAWAR · Annex D

15

25.01.2022

Clerk of counsel for the petitioner present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Addl: Advocate General for respondents present.

Former requests for adjournment due to general strike of the bar. Adjourned. To come up for further proceedings on 14.03.2022 before S.B.

(Mian Muhammad) Member(氏)



14.03.2022

Due to retirement of the Worthy Chairman, the Tribunal is defunct, therefore, case is adjourned to 09.06.2022 for the same as before.

Reader.

09.06.2022

Petitioner in person present. Mr. Muhammad Adeel Butt, Additional Advocate General alongwith Mr. Asad-ud-Din Asif Jah, Superintendent for respondents present.

Representative of the respondent department submitted Notification No. SOE(AD)21-226/80/Sardar Ali/490 dated 28.03.2022 which is placed on file and stated that the department has implemented the judgement of this Tribunal conditionally subject to CPLA. Therefore, the instant petition is disposed off. File be consigned to record room.

Certified to be ture copy

(Fareelia Paul) Member (E)

Jate of Presentation of Application
Jumber of Words
Jumber of Words
Jrgent
Jrgent
Jone of Complection
Date of Complection
Cory
Date of Delivery of Cory

one goot his (de, b) وغوى 17. بإعث تحرمرآ نكه مقدمه مندرج عنوان بالامين اپني طرف سے واسطے بيروي وجواب دہي وکل کا روا كم متعلقا أن مقام كي المرافس المروكسية مقرر کرے اقرار کیا جاتا ہے۔ کہ صاحب موصوف کومقدمہ کی کل کاروائی کا کامل اختیار : وگا۔ نیز آگ و کیل صاحب کورامنی نامه کرنے ونقر رثالت ہ فیصلہ برحلف دیسے جواب دہی اورا قبال دعوی اور بسورت ومحرى كرني اجراءا ورصولي چيك ورويسيار عرضي دعوى اور درخواست برشم كي تقيدين زرایی پردستخط کرانے کا اختیار ہوگا۔ نیزصورت عدم پیردی یا ڈگری میکطرفہ یا اپیل کی برامدگی ادرمنسوفی نیز دا نرکرنے اپیل نگرانی ونظر ثانی و بیروی کرنے کا اختیار ہوگا۔از بصورت ضرورت مقدمہ ن*و کور* ^ا کے کل یا جز وی کاروائی کے داسطےاور وکیل مامخنار قانونی کواییے ہمراہ نیااییے بجائے تقرر کا افغتیام موگانه اور مِها حب مقرر شده کوجهی و بی جمله ندکوره باا ختیارات حاصل مول محےاوراس کا ساختہ برواختة منظور قبول موكا _ دوران مقدمه مين جوخر چه د هرجانه التواسيخ مقدم کوئی تاریخ بیشی مقام دوره پر بهویا حدے باہر ہوتو وکیل صاحب یا بند ہوں مذكؤركرين لبذاوكالت نامهكصديا كمسندر ب ·2024 (5)3500 کے لئے منظور ہے۔