FORMOF ORDERSHEET

Court of	•		

Misc. application No. 4 52/2024

S.No.	Date of order proceedings	Order or other proceedings with signature of judge
1	2	3
1	07/06/2024	The Misc. application in Appeal No. 625/2022
	-	submitted today Mr. Yasir Saleem Advocate. It is fixed for
		hearing before Division Bench at Peshawar on 10.06.2024
r		Original file be requisitioned. Parcha Peshi given to counse
	Photograph	for the applicant.
		By the order of Chairman
		REGISTRAR
		The state of the s
		The Residence of the Control of the
	.,	
	•	
	, 	
`		

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR.

C.m. NO.452/2024

Service Appeal No:- 625/2022

Zia ur Rehman, Ex-Constable Police Lines, Nowshera Appellant Persus The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa & OthersRespondents

INDEX

S#	Description of the Documents	Annex	Pages
1.	Application for rectification of date alongwith affidavit	*	1-3
2.	Copy of Order & Judgment	"A"	4-11
3.	Copy of Service Appeal	"B"	12-16

Dated: - 07/06/2024

Applicant/Appellant

Through:-

Advocate Supreme Court

of Pakistan

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL, PESHAWAR.

C. M. NO 452/2024

Service Appeal No:- 625/2022

Diary No. 43.000

Zia ur Rehman, Ex-Constable Police Lines, Nowshera

..... Appellant

Versus

The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa & Others
......Respondents

APPLICATION FOR RECTIFICATION OF DATE IN THE SERVICE APPEAL & THE JUDGMENT IN THE CAPTIONED APPEAL AT PAGE NO. 03, WHERE THE DATE "03/01/2022" HAS BENN INADVERTENTLY WRITTEN DOWN AS "03/01/2021".

Respectfully Sheweth:-

1. That the captioned appeal alongwith the connected appeal No. 626/2022 titled as "Muhammad Abbas Vs PPO & Others" & Service Appeal No. 627/2022 titled as "Muhammad Abid Vs PPO & Others" were allowed by this Hon'ble Tribunal vide order and judgment dated: 15/02/2024. (Copy of Order & Judgment is attached as annexure "A").

- 2. That in the appeal, at Para No. 08 the date is inadvertently mentioned as 03/01/2021 i.e. on which the appellant went to the DPO office Nowshera to submit his reply to show cause notice was written down inadvertently as 03/01/2021 which was infact 03/01/2022. (Copy of Service Appeal is attached as annexure "B").
- 3. That due to the above mentioned mistake, at page No. 03 of the judgment the date is mentioned as 03/01/2021 instead of 03/01/2022.
- 4. That due to this clerical mistake the department is now reluctant in processing the back benefits of the applicant/appellant.
- 5. That it is in the interest of justice to rectify the mistake mentioned above and this Hon'ble Tribunal has got the jurisdiction to entertain the application.

It is, therefore, most humbly prayed that on acceptance of this application the date 03/01/2021 may be rectified as 03/01/2022 and this rectification may also be made in the judgment.

Dated:- 07/06/2024

Applicant/Appellant

Through:-

YASIR SÄLEEM
Advocate Supreme Court
Of Pakistan

AFFIDAVIT:

It is do hereby solemnly 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 Court.

DEPOMENT



0 7 JUN 2024

Annex "A"

BEFORE THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SEKVICE TRIBUNAL PESHAWAR

Service Appeal No. 625/2022

BEFORE: MRS. RASHIDA BANO ... MEMBER (J)

MISS FAREEHA PAUL ... MEMBER (E)

Zia-ur-Rehman, Ex-Constable Police Lines Nowshera.

..... (Appellant)

<u>Versus</u> .

1. The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

2. The Regional Police Officer Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

3. The District Police Officer, Nowshera.

....(Respondents)

Mr. Yasir Salim,

For appellant

Advocate

Mr. Asif Masood Ali Shah,

For respondents

Deputy District Attorney

 Date of Institution.
 26.04.2022

 Date of Hearing.
 15.02.2024

 Date of Decision.
 15.02.2024

JUDGEMENT

FAREEHA PAUL, MEMBER (E): Through this single judgment, we intend to dispose of instant service appeal as well as connected service appeal No. 626/2022, titled "Muhammad Abbas Versus the Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa etc." and Service Appeal No. 627/2022, titled "Muhammad Abid Versus Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa etc.", as in all the appeals, common STED questions of law and facts are involved.

2. The service appeal in hand has been instituted under Section 4 of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Service Tribunal Act, 1974 against the

to be true

6

impugned order dated 29.12.2021, whereby the appellant was awarded major punishment of dismissal from service, against which his departmental appeal dated 10.01.2022 was regretted vide office order dated 30.03.2022. It has been prayed that on acceptance of the appeal, the impugned orders dated 29.12.2021 and 30.03.2022 might be set aside and the appellant might be reinstated into service with all back benefits.

Brief facts of the case, as given in the memorandum of appeal, are that various posts of Police Constable BPS- 07 were advertised seeking applications from candidates. The appellant, having qualification of intermediate, duly applied for the post through online application and roll number was issued to him. He appeared in the test and qualified the test and physical test also. He was appointed by the competent authority on the recommendations of Departmental Selection Committee. After appointment, he took over the charge of his post and started performing his duties. While performing his duties, on some anonymous complaint having allegations against him, a fact finding inquiry was conducted vide letter dated 10.12.2021. The appellant appeared before the Inquiry Officer (I.O) and denied all the allegations, however, the I.O submitted his report vide letter dated 24.12.2021 and held the appellant guilty of all charges. One, Khalilullah, owner of Shaheen Printing Press, also appeared and recorded his statement before the I.O. Without issuing any charge sheet and without conducting regular inquiry, the appellant was issued final show cause notice on 28.12.2021 giving him 07 days to

Atter Con to be true

· Asy

submit his reply. On 03.01.2021, when he went to the office of DPO Nowshera to submit his reply to the show cause notice, he was informed that he had already been dismissed from service vide order dated 29.12.2021. Feeling aggrieved, he filed departmental appeal on 10.01.2022, which was regretted vide office order dated 30.03.2022;

4. Respondents were put on notice who submitted their joint written reply/comments on the appeal. We heard the learned counsel for the appellant as well as the learned Deputy District Attorney for the respondents and perused the case file with connected documents in detail.

hence the instant service appeal.

detail, argued that no proper procedure was followed before the dismissal order dated 28.12.2021 was issued. He stated that no charge sheet was served upon him nor any regular inquiry was conducted rather only a fact finding inquiry was conducted and that too in a biased manner. He further argued that without waiting for reply to show cause notice, the appellant was awarded major penalty of dismissal from service vide order dated 29.12.2021. Learned counsel further argued that the appellant was not provided fair opportunity to defend himself nor opportunity of personal hearing was afforded to him and hence he was condemned unheard. He further argued that inquiry officer had admitted in his report that the appellant, along with other dismissed candidates himself appeared for the examination. During the fact finding inquiry, it

TED

21.0

My



one Sifatullah or that he helped the appellant in solving the paper. So far as putting wrong entry of date of birth in application form was concerned, learned counsel for the appellant argued that it was not filled by the appellant himself, rather it was filled by a person sitting in Shaheen Computers Kheshgi Payan who mistakenly and unintentionally put wrong entry and the same had been stated by the I.O in his report also. Learned counsel stated that after noticing his mistake, the appellant himself brought it into the notice of ETEA administration upon which it was replied that it was not a big issue and could be rectified at the time of verification of documents. He requested that the appeal might be accepted as prayed for.

6. Learned Deputy District Attorney, while rebutting the arguments of learned counsel for the appellant, argued that a complaint was received to the then District Police Officer, Nowshera, wherein it was highlighted that a person namely Sifat Ullah S/O Farzand Ali R/O Kheshgi Bala, a school teacher, appeared for other candidates in ETEA test held for recruitment of Police Constables. Complaint further stated that Zia-ur-Rehman, Muhammad Abbas and Muhammad Abid sons of Inam Ali got their test passed through the said Sifat Ullah, who received Rs. 600,000/- from each candidate. A fact finding enquiry was conducted wherein the enquiry officer highlighted that according to ETEA report, the appellant, as well as his two brothers and one person namely Sifatullah, while submitting online application forms mentioned

Ten

2

their date of birth as 01.01.1998 and ETEA authorities allotted them roll numbers according to their dates of birth. When they were asked about their similar date of birth, they replied that they had not applied themselves rather their application forms were submitted by a person namely Khalil, owner of Shaheen Computer Kheshgi Payan, who in his statement disclosed that it was a human mistake. He further argued that the enquiry officer collected all relevant material from the ETEA authorities and recommended major punishment for the appellant. He was issued final show cause notice to which he submitted his reply on 29.12.2021 but the same was found unsatisfactory, hence he was awarded major punishment of dismissal from service. He requested that the appeal might be dismissed.

7. Arguments and record presented before us shows that the appellants, who are brothers, were awarded major punishment of dismissal from service on the ground of using fraudulent means to pass their test arranged by ETEA for appointment as Constable in the provincial police. A fact finding inquiry was conducted after receipt of an anonymous complaint wherein it was highlighted that one Sifatullah, a school teacher, appeared for some candidates, in ETEA test. Names of the appellant Ziaur Rehman, Muhammad Abbas and Muhammad Abid, had been mentioned by the complainant for whom Sifatullah appeared and solved their test papers by receiving rupees six lacs each from them. During the inquiry, it was revealed that date of birth of all the three appellants, as well as Sifatullah, was the same and they were provided

AT STED

roll numbers in series, based on that date. However, during the inquiry, it was clarified that the online forms were not filled by the appellants, rather a computer operator filled them and put the wrong information unintentionally. Inquiry Report further states that all the three appellants appeared in the examination physically, as verified through the video clip, provided by ETEA.

- 8. If we look at the procedure adopted by the Inquiry Officer in conducting the inquiry, it is found that he simply got the statements of the appellants, Sifatullah and the Computer Operator who filled the online application forms. After getting their statements, he arrived at a conclusion according to his own wisdom. He failed to take into consideration the statement of the complainant of the anonymous complaint that he had all the evidence which he was ready to share with the DPO Nowshera. No effort seems to be made by the Inquiry Officer in getting to know the complainant and the evidence that he had to present, in support of the allegations he was leveling against the appellants.
- 9. After going through the details of the appeal in hand, it has been noted that the entire proceedings were initiated on the basis of an anonymous complaint without trying to get any information about the complainant and documentary evidence to prove the allegations. In this regard the provincial government has issued clear instructions that anonymous complaints should not be entertained. Moreover, there is no denial of the fact that the appellants appeared in the written test, in

test, in the true

person, and got it passed. They also passed the physical test and were resultantly recommended for appointment. As far as order of dismissal is concerned, despite the fact that seven days were given for reply to the final show cause notice, the competent authority passed the order of dismissal in a hasty manner, on the very next day of issuance of the notice, which is against the rules. They had to wait for the reply, which was submitted on the seventh day of the receipt of the show cause notice.

- In view of the above discussion, instant appeal, alongwith the connected appeals is allowed as prayed for. Cost shall follow the event. Consign.
- 11. Pronounced in open court in Peshawar and given under our hands and seal of the Tribunal this 15th day of February, 2024.

(FARKEHA PÁUL) Member (E)

(RASHIDA BANO) Member (J)

Fazle Subhan, P.S

Cipinal **************

Date of Presentiticy

Copying Figs - -

Prante of Calif

11/2/2014

Date 01 20 Date 01 20 3/ 2074

Afficeted to He true



15th Feb. 2024 01. Mr. Yasir Saleem, Advocate for the appellant present.

Mr. Asif Masood Ali Shah, Deputy District Attorney for the respondents present. Arguments heard and record perused.

02. Vide our detailed judgment consisting of 07 pages, the appeal is allowed as prayed for. Cost shall follow the event. Consign.

03. Pronounced in open court in Peshawar and given under our hands and seal of the Tribunal on this 15th day of

(FARTEHA PAUL) Member (E)

February, 2024.

(RASHIDA BANO) Member(J)

Fazal Subhan PS

Attested to be true

Annex Ba



BFFORE THE KHYBER PUKHTUNKHWA SERVICES TRIBUNAL. PESHAWAR

Se vice Appeal No. ______/2022

Zin ur Rehman, Ex-Constable Police Lines Nowahera

APPELL AND

VAS

1. The Provincial Police Officer, Khyber Pakhtunkiiwa.

The Regional Police officer, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. the thist, of Police Officer, Nowshera.

RESPONDENTS

ı

SERVICE APPEAL U/S 4 OF THE KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA SERVICE TRIBUNAL ACT, 1974, AGAINST THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 29.12.2021, WHEREBY THE APPELLANT HAS BEEN AWARDED THE MAJOR PUNISHMENT OF DISMISSAL FROM SERVICE AGAINST WHICH HIS DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL DATED 10.01.2022 HAS ALSO BEEN REGRETTED VIDE OFFICE ORDER DATED 30.03.2022.

PRAYER:

On acceptance of this appeal the enpugned dismissal order Jated 29.12.2021 and appellate order dated 30.03.2022 may please be set aside and I may kindly be reinstated into a reice with all back bear in

Respectfully Sheweth. FACTS:

That various posts of police constable BPS-7 has been adve traed which are also uploaded on ETEA website seeking applications from desirous candidates wherein last date of sabare aton of application was shown as 30.09,2020 (Copp of the advertisement is attached as annexure A).

2. That the appellant having qualification of Intermediate, culy applied for the post so advertised through online application thereafter toll number was issued to the appellant which was conducted by educational testing and evaluation agency (ETEA) Peshawar. The appellant duly appeared in the test and fortunately qualified the test ander gone the physical test and was successful in physical test also

1/5

- I hat being successful in screening test and physical endurance test the appellant was duly appointed by the competent authority on the recommendations of duly constituted departmental selection committee. (Copy of the final merit list is attached as annexure B).
- 4 Inst after appointment the appellant took charge of his post and started performing his duties. The appellant was assigned duty for body election 2021. (Copies of Nagal Madh & daily Telisitwise Deployment at polling stations is attached as annexure C).

white entermine its duties in the said capacity, a fact finding the later transfer wide letter dated 10.12.2021 on some the epiper of (Copy of letter dated 10.12.2021 is attached as annexitie D).

The cower the inquery officer at nartial manner at the free point of submitted his seport of attendance and the free point of submitted his seport of a attendance and held the of all charges, here one III lift I litable owner of Suaheen and the content of submitted and all tensions before the inquiry of fig. (Copies of statements and facts findings inquiry report that 4 24 12 2021 are attached as annexure b&F).

if our amount the fact fact in the report of without issuing and an income of the transfer of the continuous of the cont

to the state of the second of the order of DPO to the second of the second of the second of the second of the order of DPO Nowsners on the Copies of reply to Show Cause Notice dated 03.01.2022, as recept and dismissal order dated 29.12.2021 are attached as amazure II & D.

order Janea 30 03 2022 pre attached as annexure J. & K).

That the expanse of ender is illegal unlaw for against the law and fact than as so of the besset aside inter-alia on the following grounds,

attes ted

GROUNDS OF SERVICE APPEAL

- A. That the appellant have not been treated in accordance with law hence my rights secured and guaranteed under the law and constitution is badly violated.
- B. That no proper procedure has been followed before the dismissal order dated 28.12.2021, no charge sheet has been served upon me nor any regular inquiry has been conducted Only a fact finding was conducted and that too in a very partial and biased manner, thus the impugned order is liable to be set aside on this sence alone.
- That time astonishingly and illegally without whiting for reply of the appellant on the very next day he was available to major pepulty of displant from process vide office and a control of 20, 2, 202.
 - D. That findings of the inquiry report was not provided to the appellant and as such he was not provided fair opportunity of defend himself and as such the unpugned order as defective and liable to be set aside.
 - that he could be able to know the outcome of inquiry of application under RTI Act is attached as annexure I).
 - That the appellant have not been given opportunity of personal hear on before the assumed of the impagned order hence—have been condemned unnessed.
 - c. that the emplian duly applied for the post appeared in screening and physical test and remained succession, I only took over charge of my post and started performing my duties, thus the order of my appointment has been acted upon and valuable agains has been created in my favour. As principle of LOCUS PONATENTIE strongly lies in my favor so my service could not be snatched away illegally with one stroke of pen.
 - I hat the appellant was appointed by the completent authority after observing all codal formalities, no illegality or irregularity has been committed in the process of appointment.

m of G.

- I. That the inquiry officer hadradmitted during his report that the ar plicant along with sother dismissed candidates homeelf appeared for the examination. It is pertinent to mention here that during the fact finding inquiry, it was never proved that the paper of the applicant was actually filled by one Sifacultah or that the said Sifatullah had helped the applicant in solving be paper, though in his inquiry report he, without any ecoof or justification concludes that the applicant used illegal ways to case at a exams. Thus the whole precedence conducted argum the applicant prior to his directors as a self-call of the factive at cattal and thus not sustainable in the upon of laws.
- In the so far as putting wrong entry of date or both in application form is a concern, it was submitted to the inquiry office, and the applicant did not himself till his form rather it was filled by a person sitting in Shaheen Computers Kheshki Payan who instakenty and emintentionally put wrong entries in his onime form who personally appeared before the inquiry officer and admitted his mistake as there were hundreds of forms to be filled by him on that day it is pertinent to mention here that after noticing his mistake the applicant hunself prought it to in the notice of ETEA Administration however the applicant was replied that it was not a big issue and can be rectified in the time of verification of documents.
- That if all there was any irregularity committed in the process of submission of online forms, the same can neither be attributed to the undersigned not can be be purashed for the faults or lapses committed by others.
- I That the applicant was appointed after the regors of a competent authority on the recommendations of duty constituted departmental selection committee and he after appointment took charge of his post so valuable rights has been accounted in the favor of applicant which can not be snatched through any illegal means.
- M. That the appellant have never committed any act or omission which could be termed as intscended, albeit he was awarded major penalty of dismissal from service.
- N. That the appellant is young and energetic and wants to service for his department albeit his career has been stigmatized by the impugned dismissal order.

Attesion De tra-

O. That the appellant seek permission to advance other grounds and proofs at the time of hearing.

It is, therefore, most humbly prayed that On neceptance of this appeal the impugued dismissal order dated 29.12.2021 and appellate order dated 30.03.2022 may please be set aside and I may kindly be reinstated into service with all back benefits.

Any other relief as deemed appropriate in circumstances of the case, not specifically asked for, may also be granted to the appellant.

Appellant

Through.

Yasir Salgent Advocate High Court,

Peshawar

Certificate:-

It is certify that no such like <u>Service Appeal</u> has earlier been filed by the Appellant in this Honourable Tribunal.

OVOCATE.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Zia Ullah Khan S/O Nawar Khan Ex- Arabic Teacher G MS Adam Abad Swabi, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare on oath that contents of the accompanying Service Appeal are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed from this Hon'ble Irioural.

DEPONENT

or Congression