Form- A FORM OF ORDER SHEET

Court of		<u>.</u>
Implementation Petition	No.	391/2024

S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2-	3
1	21.05.2024	The implementation petition of Mr. Jameel
		Rasool submitted today by Syed Roman Shah Advocate.
	`,	It is fixed for implementation report before Single Bench
,		at Peshawar on 23.05.2024. Original file be requisitioned.
	•	AAG has noted the next date. Parcha Peshi given to the
,		counsel for the petitioner.
		By the order of Chairman
,		REGISTRAR
	- ,.	
i		
	•	

BEFORE THE SERVICE TRIBUNAL KHYBER

PAKHTUNKHWAPESHAWAR

Khyber Pakhtukan Sarvice Tribunat

Execution Petition No. 391 /2024, In Service appeal no. 580 of 2023 2024

Jamal Rasool S/o Rasool Badshah Ex-Police Constable R/o Kanda Karak, Tehsil and District Karak Petitioner

Versus

- Inspector General of Police, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar
 Regional Police Officer, Kohat Region, Kohat
- 3. District Police Officer, Karak

..... Respondents

PETITION FOR DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT TO IMPLEMENT THE JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 22/02/2024 OF THIS HONORABLE TRIBUNAL, IN THE ABOVE NOTED APPEAL.

Respectfully Sheweth;

Applicant humbly submits as under

- 1. That the above noted appeal has been decided on 22/02/2024, by this honorable tribunal.
- 2. That the appeal of the petitioner has been remitted to the department / respondents for holding proper inquiry in to the matter and conclude the report within 60 days of receipt of judgment. (Copy of the judgment is attached as annexure-A)
 - 3. That the petitioner has approached time and again to the respondent to implement the judgment of this hon'ble tribunal but the respondent deaf eared to the request of the petitioner. (Application is Attached as Annexure -B)

- 4. That now the petitioner has no other remedy but to approached this Hon'ble tribunal for the implementation of this tribunal order dated 22/02/2024.
- 5. That there is no bar in filing of this petition, and this petition is well within time.

It is therefore most humbly prayed that upon acceptance of this petition, the respondents may please be directed to implement the order and judgment of this Hon'ble tribunal Dated 22/02/2024, and to punish the respondents for defiance of this Hon'ble tribunal order dated 22/02/2024.

Petitioner

Through

Syed Roman Shah

Advocate High Court

AFFIDIVIT

I, Jamal Rasool S/o Rasool Badshah Ex-Police Constable R/o Kanda Karak, Tehsil and District Karak, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare on oath that the contents of the above petition is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Honorable tribunal.

کال کر جول Deponent BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL **PESHAWAR**

Service Appeal No. 580/2023

BEFORE: KALIM ARSHAD KHAN

CHAIRMAN

MISS FAREEHA PAUL

1. MEMBER(E)

Mr. Jamal Rasool S/O Rasool Badshah R/O Kanda Karak, Tehsil and District Karak.....(Appellant)

Versus

1. Inspector General of Police, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.

2. The Regional Police Officer, Kohat Region, Kohat.

3. District Police Officer Karak.

4. Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Chief Secretary, Peshawar.(Respondents)

Mr. Shahid Qayum Khattak,

Advocate

For appellant

Mr. Asif Masood Ali Shah.

For respondents

Annexure A"

Deputy District Attorney

17.03.2023 Date of Institution..... 22.02.2024 Date of Hearing.....

22.02.2024 Date of Decision.....

JUDGEMENT

FAREEHA PAUL, MEMBER (E): The service appeal in hand has been instituted under Section 4 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Service Tribunal Act, 1974, against the order dated 09.01.2023 passed by respondent No. 3, punishment awarded major was appellani whereby the termination/removal from service and against the order dated 14.02.2023, issued on 01.03.2023 passed by respondent No. 2 vide which his departmental appeal was rejected. It has been prayed that on acceptance of the appeal, the impugned orders dated 09.01.2023 and 14.02.2023 might be

set aside and the appellant might be held entitled for all back benefits of pay and service.

- 2. Brief facts of the case, as given in the memorandum of appeal, are that respondent No. 3 initiated disciplinary proceedings against the appellant and issued charge sheet and statement of allegations to him. Thereafter, an inquiry was initiated against him and respondent No. 3 passed an order dated 09.01.2023 vide which major punishment of termination/removal from service was passed against him without collecting any evidence and providing an opportunity, of hearing to him. Feeling aggrieved, he filed departmental appeal/representation before respondent No. 2 which was rejected on 14.02.2023 issued on 01.03.2023; hence the instant service appeal.
- 3. Respondents were put on notice. They submitted written reply/comments on the appeal. We heard the learned counsel for the appellant as well as learned Deputy District Attorney for the respondents and perused the case file with connected documents in detail.
- 4. Learned counsel for the appellant, after presenting the case in detail, argued that the impugned orders were harsh, without any evidence, based on surmises & conjectures and against the principle of natural justice. He further argued that during the enquiry proceedings no one was examined in support of the charges levelled against the appellant nor any opportunity of hearing was provided to him. He was not confronted with any documentary or other kind of evidence. He further argued that it was a settled principle of justice that no one should be condemned unheard but in the instant case no

TISTED

other at

proper enquiry was conducted. He requested that the appeal might be accepted as prayed for

I earned Deputy District Attorney, while rebutting the arguments of 5. teamed counsel for the appellant, argued that the appellant was charged for making deceit and fraud in recruitment as Constable in the Police Department. He had not qualified ETEA test for recruitment as Constable for the year 2020-21 and was not recommended in the psychological assessment and final interview by the Regional Selection Board on account of his mental health condition. The Review Board held at CPO had also not recommended him for appointment. The learned DDA argued that in the recommendation list received from CPO Peshawar to District Karak, appellant was shown as "recommended" while in another list provided by SSU (CPEC) CPO Peshawar he was "not recommended". Similarly, in another list from CPO Peshawar dated 29.12.2021, appellant was not recommended. According to the learned DDA, the appellant fraudulently succeeded in getting his appointment order on the basis of tempered recommendation. The SDPO Takht-e-Nasrati conducted the enquiry against the appellant by fulfilling all the codal formalities, recorded the statements and collected evidence on record and the appellant was held guilty of gross misconduct. Respondent No. 3, being competent authority, heard him personally, but he failed to defend himself and, hence, major punishment was awarded to him after fulfilling all procedural and legal formulities. He requested that the appeal might be dismissed.

ATTSTL-

The appellant was recruited as Constable in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwu 6 Police through IFIEA 2020-21, and was issued belt No. 4984. At some later stage, it came to the knowledge of the respondent department that the appellant was not recommended by the Regional Selection Board but he got himself recruited through fraud and deception. An inquiry was conducted and he was awarded major punishment of termination/removal from service. According to the inquiry report annexed with the reply of the respondents. two merit/selection lists, bearing the same number 14699-720/E-IV and date 29.12.2022, were received from the office of CPO. In one of the lists, the appellant was "recommended" at serial no. 102 whereas in the other, he was placed at the same serial no, but with the remarks "not recommended". The respondents have attached another order at Annex A-3 of their reply, dated 30.12.2021 signed by District Police Officer, Karak, which shows that 124 candidates were enlisted/recruited as Constables in BS- 7 and the appellant is at serial No.123 of that order. Each page of that order has been signed by the DPO Kurak. One completely fails to understand that how the appellant managed to get his name enlisted in all these lists and orders? When asked, the learned Deputy District Attorney stated that he did not have any answer to the query as to how the admittedly received letter from the CPO was maneuvered by the appellant, whereby he had been shown to have been recommended. In pursuance of the query from the bench, learned DDA did not hesitate to provide his statement in writing. Similarly the departmental representative, an official of Inspector rank, was not able to respond to the query of this bench that how the Inquiry Officer proved the allegations

ATTSTL-

*against the appellant when both the letters, on which he based his finding report, were issued by the same authority.

From the above discussion, it appears that no effort has been made by 7. the department to look into the matter of issuance of two letters bearing the same number and date from the office of Inspector General of Police, Central Police Office, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa to ascertain the facts. It further transpires that no one in the CPO bothered to give a second look to the letter and confirm the recommendations of Regional Selection Board and the CPO Review Board.

· 8. The appeal in hand is, therefore, remitted to the respondent department for holding proper inquiry into the matter and conclude the report within sixty days of the receipt of this judgment. The issue of back benefits is subject to the outcome of inquiry report. Cost shall follow the event. Consign.

9. Pronounced in open court in Peshawar and given under our hands and seal of the Tribunal on this 22nd day of February, 2024.

(FAREEHA PAUL)

Member (E)

(KALIM ARSHAD KHAN)

Chairman

FuzlaSubhan, P.5

Date of Presentation of An

Number of Words-

Corying Foc

22/2/24

Annexure-B' صد سالی e visortidiv الديد بر سامل عرباتي لولين غير كنو كو اصلح برك سي لطرسيا هي يقرف مواضا . اور جميم عرف كرے لولس فرنسك كولس لوس للرينيك الربا ها الديد ووال أرينيك الم من ك ارد ووام www. 25-0-23 بر بركر سائل ع ملاست بر كالى ليك عدالت في ب جرين ما مر تو فر ا سروس تر یولی لیما در س سروس ایلی نه 580/2023 23.2.24,0,0 2 - 1000 = 1000 | - 100 B9-5-25 PM الرصم ما يى ما ھے . صى كائت رسائدنى كى وردا بات مارى صى CHINIFER IN PLOSER IN POSE SAL IN DES - POPENS لرف الورف مرتب رب المقل من عوالت لف تعلا ع The John Super is a lipe the down of a بر الحرب ما مر فيما ما أ دايرى ملى بوك الرسائي في ال من تولي موالى كالله الله سن اب ساستاه عاصد سال درواس لله فراسب ر ماد و مار سال المرز مانس علی بول و در رسول با دستاه سند کنده کود تقیل و صلح در كى بى باك يۇرىكى كورىت بىزىم جىنىدى مادى مادى كالى كالىندى نه السير عبد يولس في مجنو فوالت در ناز رخل بولس ان معاب والمد والمن كوات ATTOTED

مال کولینام کولس ولار ا دعوى جرم باعث تحريرة نكه مقدم مند رجعنوان بالامين ابى طرف سے داسطے بيروى دجواب دہى دكل كارواكى محتولقة أن مقام مي مي مي ميروط في سياه ليولي ، مقرر کرے اقرار کیا جاتا ہے۔ کہ صاحب موصوف کومقدمہ کی کل کاروائی کا کامل اختیار ہوگا۔ نیز وكيل صاحب كوراضى نامه كرنے وتقرر ثالت و فيصله برحلف ديئے جواب دہلی اورا قبال دعوى اور بسورت ذاكرى كرنے اجراء اور صولى چيك وروبيدار عرضى دعوى اور درخواست ہرتتم كى تقدريق زرایں پردستخط کرانے کا اختیار ہوگا۔ نیز صورت عدم بیردی یا ڈگری میطرف یا بیل کی برامدگی اورمنسوخی نیز دانز کرنے اپیل مگرانی ونظر ثانی و پیروی کرنے کا ختیار ہوگا۔ از بصورت مظرورت مقدمہ مذکور کے کل یاجزوی کاروائی کے واسطے اور وکیل یا مختار قانونی کوایے ہمراہ یاا لیے بجائے تقرر کا اختیار هوگا _ا در مساحب مقرر شده کوئیمی و بی جمله ند کوره بااختیارات حاصل موں ملے اور اس کا ساختہ برواخته منظور تبول موكا _ دوران مقدمه ميل جوخر چهد هرجانه التواعے مقدم كسب سے و موكا _ کوئی تاریخ بیشی مقام دورہ پرہویا حدہ ہا ہر ہوتو وکیل صاحب پابند ہوں ہے۔ کہ پیروی ندکورکریں۔لہذاوکالت نامیکھدیا کے سندرہے۔ 2 63 کے لئے منظور ہے۔