


his other colleagues were promoted with all consequential benefits."

The Supreme of Pakistan neither modified judgment of this Tribunal nor the petitioner showed his satisfaction upon the same, therefore, in my humble view judgment of this Tribunal is still in field and objection raised by the respondents is turned down. Respondents are directed to implement the judgment in true letter and spirit by ante-dating promotion notification of BPS-16 and 17 to the date when junior of the petitioner were promoted with all consequential benefits. To come up for implementation report on 30.11.2024 before S.B. P.P given to the parties.


Rashida Bano
Member (J)

09.10.2024 1. Learned counsel for the petitioner present. Mr. Naseer Uddin Shah, Assistant Advocate General along with Mr. Sohrab Khan, Assistant Professor for the respondents present.

2. Respondents submitted reply to the execution petition wherein they have taken the plea in para 4 that they have filed CPLA before the august Supreme Court of Pakistan which was fixed for 08.11.2023. On the said date they produced a copy of notification dated 11.12.2019 vide which petitioner was promoted to the post of Assistant/Senior Scale Stenographer BPS-16 and notification dated 09.05.2023 vide which he was promoted to the post of Superintendent BPS-17 on acting charge basis. Both the notifications were issued with immediate effect. The Supreme Court showed satisfaction and disposed of CPLA accordingly, which means that Supreme Court modified judgment of this Tribunal and objected that the instant execution petition could not be executed further.

3. In my humble view, it is respondents who filed CPLA and they produced before the court the above-mentioned notifications and stated that they have implemented the judgment of this Tribunal. Perusal of judgment reveals that petitioner seeks ante-dation of his promotion to BPS-16 order of which was passed on 08.12.2020. Concluding para is reproduced as follows:

"In view of the above, the instant appeal is accepted on the above terms with direction to the respondent No.4 to place the appellant on the seniority position, he was holding in the seniority list prior to bifurcation of the department and to consider his promotion both of BPS-16 and 17 from the dates

