

**HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD**

**C.P No. D-1572 of 2025**

[Dr. Manjhee Jatoi & Ors. vs. Province of Sindh & Ors.]

**&**

**C.P No. D-1712 of 2025**

[Dr. Saba Anwar vs. Province of Sindh & Ors.]

**BEFORE:**

**JUSTICE MUHAMMAD SALEEM JESSAR**

**JUSTICE NISAR AHMED BHANBHRO**

**CPD 1572 of 2025**

Petitioners:

Dr Manjhee Jatoi

& 13 others

Mr. Aayatullah Khuwaja, advocate

**CPD 1712 of 2025**

Petitioner:

Saba Anwer

Mr. Pervez Tarique Tagar, advocate

Respondent No 2 to 4

SPSC

M/s Raja Ali Wahid Kunwar

and Zahoor Ahmed Chadhar advocates

a/w Additional Controller SPSC [**Imtiaz Ahmed Jagirani**] and Assistant Director SPSC [**Ayaz Ahmed**]

Respondent No 1

Province of Sindh

M/s Muhammad Ismail Bhutto

Additional A.G Sindh and

Rafique Ahmed Dahri Assistant A.G Sindh

Respondent No 5

Dr Mubarak Ali Jatoi

In Person

**Date of hearing : 21.10.2025**

**Date of Decision : 31.10.2025**

**Date of Announcement : 20.11.2025**

**J U D G M E N T**

.....

**NISAR AHMED BHANBHRO, J:-** Through these petitions, the petitioners have challenged the recommendation dated 12.08.2025 rendered by the respondent Sindh Public Service Commission (SPSC) for appointment in respect of the post of Veterinary Officer/Research Officer Animal

Husbandry Wing (BS-17) in Livestock and Fisheries Department Government of Sindh.

2. Since common question of fact and law is involved in both these Petitions; therefore, both are proposed to be decided through this common order.

3. Case of the petitioners is that respondent SPSC through advertisement bearing No.04 of 2025 dated 11.03.2025 announced various posts including 126 posts of Veterinary Officer/Research Officer Animal Husbandry Wing (BS-17) in Livestock and Fisheries Department Government of Sindh (**subject post**); the petitioners being eligible applied for the subject post, participated in the written test; that result of written test was announced wherein approximately 277 candidates including petitioners qualified the written test; that petitioners and other qualified candidates were called for interview; that petitioners appeared before the interview committee and vide press release dated 07.08.2025 SPSC announced results and vide letter dated 12.08.2025 made recommendation for the subject post; that the names of petitioners were not mentioned in the list despite the fact that petitioners replied all the questions satisfactorily; that against such highhandedness the petitioners filed representation under Regulation 161 of Recruitment & Management Regulations 2023 (RMR), which resulted in dismissal, however, during pendency of this petition. Henc this Petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners argued that actions of the respondent SPSC were based on malafide intentions from its very beginning, the written test result announced earlier was revised before interview; that despite directions issued by this Court and the Apex Court, respondent SPSC did not announce complete result of interview and only announced the names of pass candidates; that there are multiple illegalities and irregularities in recruitment process for the subject post; like unexplained domicile change, mandated quota system violation and various other discrepancies; that despite delivering an outstanding performance in the interview the petitioners met with a grave injustice at the hands of respondent SPSC; that interview panel was consisting upon two members i.e one from SPSC and other technical member nominated from Livestock Department i.e Director General Livestock/respondent No.5; that the

respondent No.5 was most relevant person to indicate anomalies in interview process; that respondent No.5 expressed on social media that injustice was done with meritorious candidates; that petitioners preferred representations under Regulation No. 161 of RMR, that representation were decided during pendency of petition(s), which itself shown malafides on part of respondent SPSC. Lastly; he prayed for allowing this petition.

5. Conversely learned Additional A.G Sindh, duly assisted by learned counsel for the respondent SPSC, challenged the maintainability of this petition and argued that only eight petitioners preferred representations out of which only four appeared before the authority while four remained absent; that representations of the petitioner(s) have been decided and now they have the remedy before appellate forum, hence, this petition is not maintainable; that it has been held time and again by the Learned Apex Court that Courts cannot intervene in the interview process of Public Service Commission; that petitioners are not entitled for any of the reliefs, as it is the requirement of law that one who seeks equity must come with clean hands and do equity; that total 1121 candidates appeared in written test out of which 227 qualified; that meantime a letter dated 05.06.2025 was received from the administrative Department regarding change in number of seats quota wise; that in the light of said letter the result was updated/revised through corrigendum wherein 277 candidates were declared pass in written test; that there is no irregularity or discrepancies in recruitment process and/or domicile; that since the petitioners could not reply the questions put to them during interview, they were declared fail. In support of their contentions, they relied upon the cases of Muhammad Ashraf Sangri Vs Federation of Pakistan and others (**2014 SCMR 157**), Federation of Pakistan through Secretary Establishment Vs. Ghulam Shabir Jiskani (**2011 SCMR 1198**), Muhammad Safeer Vs. Muhammad Azam (**PLD 2024 838 SC**) and Province of Punjab through Secretary Communication and Works Department Lahore Vs. Yasir Majeed Shaikh (**2021 SCMR 624**).

6. Arguments heard and record perused.

7. Meticulous perusal of the record revealed that petitioners qualified the written test for the subject post, however, they were not recommended

by the respondent SPSC on the premise that they failed in interview, against which petitioners filed their representations under Regulation 161 of RMR (available at page-169 193 of file of C.P No.D-1572 of 2025 while at page-83 to 85 of file of C.P No.D-1712 of 2025) before the Commission with specific allegations of malpractices, violation of merits, violation of quota reserved for female and minority candidates and favouritism in the appointment process. The Member Appeal did not consider the points raised by the Petitioners while deciding representations and decided all representations through stereotyped orders dated 04.09.2025 and 30.08.2025 while relying upon the case of Muhammad Ashraf Sangri (supra), wherein it was held that the interview was a subjective assessment and it was not possible for a court of law to substitute its own opinion for that of the Interview Board. The other grounds of challenge were not considered by the Member Appeals as was evident from the order dated 04.09.2025 available at page No 167 of the reply filed by Respondent SPSC.

8. It further transpired from record that one of the members of interview panel namely Dr. Mubarak Ali Jatoi/Director General Livestock and Fisheries Department recorded reservations on recommendations for appointment dated 12.08.2025 on the subject post through social media posts. This plea has been specifically raised in para No 17 to 19 of the Petition, which reads as under:

*17. That it is submitted that interview panel consisted of two members i.e one from SPSC and other was technical member from the livestock and fisheries department/ respondent No 5 Mubarak Jatoi (Director General Live Stock Extension and Research Bs 20) who was conducting major portion of the interview on the subject side being the competent person, is the most relevant person to indicate the anomalies of the interview.*

*18. That it is also important to describe here that it was the SPSC who called the expert's name from the Government. The Government sent three names amongst which the name of Dr Mubarak was selected as member by SPSC itself.*

*19. That the landmark importance here is that when a candidate agitated on these illegal and highhandedness of SPSC on Social Media, the Respondent No 5 also put a very remarkable note on it on social media that there are illegalities and injustice has occurred with the candidates therefore it is very important after the public post of Respondent No 5, the SPSC is required to bring all the record and proceedings of the recruitment process before the Court of law for scrutiny.*

9. SPSC in its reply has not specifically denied the statement of Dr Mubarak Ali posted through Social Media showing dissatisfaction and maneuver in the recommendations by SPSC. Dr Mubarak Ali Jatoi / Respondent No 5 has also not denied the assertions of Petitioner in its reply to the Petition. Both SPSC and Respondent No 5 have given evasive denial to para No 17 to 19 of petition. If an assertion in the plaint was denied evasively, it amounted to admission.

10. Regulation 161 of the RMR casts an obligation upon the Member Appeals to investigate into the complaint of an aggrieved candidate thoroughly and decide it after proper assessment of the evidence adduced and material placed on record. For the sake of convenience Regulation 161 is reproduced hereunder:

**161. Right of Representation & Appeal.** *A candidate aggrieved by any decision of the Commission or the nominated Member under the preceding regulations may, within 15 days of the communication of such decision, prefer a representation addressed to the Chairperson and submitted to the Secretary of the Commission adducing evidence in support of his/her claim. The Secretary, upon receipt of such representation, shall forthwith seek nomination of a Member from the Chairperson. The Member so nominated shall, within the next 15 days, hear the aggrieved candidate, evaluate the evidence produced by him/her, seek any counter evidence or explanation by the concerned Branch/Section of the 15 Commission and announce his/her decision through a speaking order mentioning therein the respective versions of the parties and weighing them against the relevant provisions of law, rules and regulations. Any party aggrieved by the decision of the Member may, within 10 days of the announcement of such decision, prefer an Appeal to the Chairperson. The Chairperson, upon receipt of the Appeal, shall constitute a Committee comprising atleast 02 Members to hear the Appeal. The Member against whose decision the Appeal is preferred, shall not be a Member of the Appellate Committee. The Appellate Committee shall, after giving an opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, dispose of the Appeal through a speaking order within the next 10 days. The decision of the Appellate Committee shall be final and binding on the parties.*

11. In the case of recruitment under instant lis, one of the members of interview Panel (Dr. Mubarak Ali Jatoi) manifested his discontent on result of the subject post, therefore, it was/is incumbent upon the Commission to summon him and enquire him as to what irregularities have been committed

during interview process, however, the Member (Appeals), failed to exercise the powers conferred on him under Regulation No.161, that resulted in overburdening this Court through litigations.

12. The SPSC is saddled with the sacred responsibility of recruitment in civil service of the province. Violation of law or compromise on merit and transparency in recruitment process will result in miscarriage of justice. The recommendation of appointment of an ineligible candidate against merit will definitely result in bad governance in future. Recruitment to a public post is not mere formality but a sacred trust, it shapes the future of nation, therefore, the recruitment process has to be undertaken with due care and caution, ensuring transparency and merit.

13. The purpose of establishing Public Service Commission is to ensure that the recruitment process should be up to the mark and transparent and only competent persons ought to give way to serve rather than incompetent and unskillful persons. Appointments which disregard merit perpetuate bad governance, and drain the public exchequer; such appointments also erode the credibility of the Commission and the Government. The performance of the Government is also adversely affected, the consequences of which is borne by the public. Those given the responsibility to select the best candidates must acquit themselves of the trust reposed in them to the best of their ability and, needless to state, without any fear or favour. If the Public Service Commission made recommendations under extraneous consideration or the merit and transparency are compromised there remained no reason to undertake burdensome and time-consuming exercise of scrutinizing the applications, conducting tests and interviews, the better and open option was to induct the blue-eyed boys without entering into competitive process. If through a discriminatory selection process civil servants are selected and appointed it would infringe Article 27 of the Constitution which states that, "No citizen otherwise qualified for appointment in the service of Pakistan shall be discriminated against." Article 25, prescribing the equality of citizens, is another Fundamental Right which is attracted if all those who are tested and interviewed are not treated equally. The present matter also involves the contravention of the Fundamental Right enshrined in Article 18 which mandates, that, "every

citizen shall have the right to enter upon any lawful profession or occupation".

14. In the case of Ayaz and others V. Mustafa Saeed and others reported as 2025 SCMR 216 Honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan while highlighting the purpose of holding examination by the SPSC has held that:

*10. The purpose of holding any examination by the SPSC is to select and choose the most deserving and competent candidates. The wrong selection of "blue-eyed" candidates, based on nepotism, favoritism, or external pressures, leads to chaos and turmoil in the civil service structure, creating unrest and discontent among civil servants with serious repercussions. In all fairness, merit should be the sole criterion in the selection process, as it is an integral part of good governance. A lack of transparency or preferential treatment of undeserving candidates in the appointment process amounts to a brutal murder of merit and excellence. The appointment process must be transparent, ensuring that only competent individuals are allowed to serve, rather than those who are incompetent and unskilled. The menace of favoritism, nepotism, and preferential treatment in the appointment process of civil servants is always considered pernicious and devastating. The utmost compelling advantage of transparency in recruitment is that it essentially ratifies and disseminates public confidence in the impartiality of the process and authenticates that the appointments are not manipulated or a sham. A transparent recruiting process should be marked by unambiguity, uprightness, trustworthiness, and evenhandedness. Honesty and integrity are the best means to magnetize talented individuals suited for the job, and an open-minded selection process should be based on objective criteria free from any extraneous considerations, while providing every candidate with a fair and equal opportunity to compete.*

15. In another case of SUO MOTU ACTION REGARDING ELIGIBILITY OF CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF SINDH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ETC.: In the matter of reported as 2017 S C M R 637 Honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan held that:

*24. The Commission and the Government are obliged to ensure complete transparency in the process of selection and appointment respectively and anything less is unacceptable. If qualified and competent individuals are appointed their performance and work would be far superior to the inept allowed in through the back door of nepotism and/or corruption. Those who have earned the privilege yearn to serve the nation and the people, unlike those whose loadstar is nepotism or corruption. Since tax payers are paying dearly to be served by the best they are entitled to get the best. If the incompetent or the corrupt ingratiate themselves into the civil service, citizens are deprived of their due. The hapless taxpayers foot a never ending bill which includes the salaries and other emoluments of civil servants till they retire, and after their retirement their pensions and other benefits. And they are denied the benefit of competent and honest*

*individuals. Appointments which disregard merit, perpetuate bad governance, and drain the public exchequer; such appointments also erode the credibility of the Commission and the Government. The performance of the Government is also adversely affected, the consequences of which is borne by the public. Those given the responsibility to select the best candidates must acquit themselves of the trust reposed in them to the best of their ability and, needless to state, without any fear or favour.*

16. Selection of the persons to a post was an uphill task, it is a sacred trust, duty and obligation towards nation. The persons assigned this task are required to act honestly, fairly, in a just and transparent manner, and in the best interest of the public. The individuals so selected will serve the nation for decades, if they are appointed under nepotism and favoritism by occupying the chair they will start plundering the public money and encroach upon the executive authority which they never deserved. Therefore, not selecting “best of the best” in public service offices is a gross breach of the public trust and an offence against the nation as a whole who has the right to be served by the best. It is also a blatant violation of the rights of those who may be available for the same posts and whose rights to the said posts are denied to them by appointing unqualified or even less qualified individuals. There is no room in present day’s well connected global world for unjust and unfair practices to foster and invigorate the incompetent persons as substitute to well deserving.

17. In the case of CHIEF SECRETARY PUNJAB and others V. ABDUL RAOOF DASTI reported as 2006 S C M R 1876 Honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that:

*26. It is our misfortune that when we are looking for individuals to serve our own-selves, we search for the best of doctors, the best of architects, the best of lawyers, the best of engineers, the best of cooks, the best of butlers and so on but when it comes to selecting similar individuals to serve the public, we get swayed by nepotism, by petty personal interests and by other similar ulterior and extraneous considerations and settle for the ones not worthy of serving the public in the requisite manner. We need to remind ourselves that choosing persons for public service was not just providing a job and the consequent livelihood to the one in need but was a sacred trust to be discharged by the ones charged with it, honestly, fairly, in a just and transparent manner and in the best interest of the public. The individuals so selected are to be paid not out of the private pockets of the ones appointing them but by the people through the public exchequer. Therefore, we must keep it in mind that not selecting the best as public servants was a gross breach of the public trust and was*



*an offence against the public who had right to be served by the best. It is also blatant violation of the rights of those who may be available and whose rights to the said posts are denied to them by appointing unqualified or even less qualified persons to such posts. Such a practice and conduct is highly unjust and spreads a message from ones in authority that might was right and not vice versa which message gets gradually permeated to the very gross root level leading ultimately to a society having no respect for law, justice and fair play. And it is the said evil norms which ultimately lead to anarchic and chaotic situations in the society. It is about time we suppressed such-like evils tendencies and eliminated them before the same eliminated us all.*

18. The SPSC Act 2022 was enacted and RMR 2023 were framed pursuant to directions issued by a Learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of Imtiaz Ali Thebo and others in CP No D 2696 / 2019 vide Order dated 03.06.2021 in which one of us (**Mr. Justice Muhammad Saleem Jessar**) was a member. It would be advantageous to reproduce the relevant para 38 of the order, which reads as below:

*"38. Having come to the irresistible conclusion that, when (a) the framers of the Constitution consciously chose to abstain from making provisions for mandatory creation of Public Service Commission; (b) the Chief Minister of Sindh having no powers to appoint Chairman and Members of the Commission under Rule 5(II)/Schedule-III/Entry(3) of the Sindh Government Rules of Business 1986; (c) the appointments of Chairman and Members of the Commission made under Rule 5(2) and (3) of Sindh Public Service Commission (Appointment of Chairman and Member) Rules 2017 being violative of the Rules of Business and made with utter disregard to the maintenance of political neutrality of the Commission; (d) No right to appeal having been provided to an aggrieved person; (e) Chairman and Members having taken no oath of office; (1) function of "Examination" of candidates restricted to Testing and then narrowed down to Interviewing under the Sindh Civil Servants (Functions) Rules, 1990 being ultra vires to the provisions of 1989 Act; (g) no Annual Reports as required by Section 9(1) of the Act, 1989 having been made available to the Public; (h) no data having been made available with regards advice refusal of the Commission under Section 8 of the Act, 1989 then how could one expect that any legit and useful fruit could be borne by this skewed and merit-throttling recruiting process; that's why Courts are kept engaged by Commission's Members and operatives constantly on a permanent basis since inception of the Commission in the year 1989 when the said Act was enacted for no Constitutionally compelling reasons in the presence of Sindh Civil Servants (Appointment, Promotion & Transfer) Rules, 1974; the Sindh Civil Servants (Probation, Confirmation and Seniority) Rules, 1975; the Sindh Civil Servants Act, 1973 and half a dozen alike laws/rules; and*

*whereas, the Province (to a great extent) had been well served by honest, qualified and motivated civil servants before 1989 when this institution in its present form was born according to one view, to serve as "one window facility to foster wholesale corruption" , has lost every shred of legitimacy and ought to be brought to a nullity in its present form. Accordingly for these reasons:*

- i. Implementation of Sindh Public Service Commission Act, 1989 (in Its present form) being ultra vires to the Constitution, Sindh Public Service Commission (Appointment of Chairman and Member) Rules 2017 being violative of the Sindh Government Rules of Business, 1986; Sindh Public Service Commission (Functions) Rules, 1990 being ultra vires to the Sindh Public Service Commission Act 1989 are suspended forthwith.*
- ii. All test, Interviews, selection, appointments, tenders etc. or any act doable under the Sindh Public Service Commission Act, 1989 or the Rules/Regulations made thereunder are suspended forthwith. Individuals suspended by our order dated 15.04.2021 shall remain so.*
- iii. In case the Provincial Government wishes to re-enact these Laws/rules, it may draw some Inspiration from such laws enacted in developing countries like Australia or New Zealand to deliver the premise of "right man/woman for the right Job" without fear or favour.*
- iv. In the meanwhile, all new recruitments strictly on merit be made in the same manner as those appointments were made prior to the enactment of the Sindh Public Service Commission Act, 1989, as if the said Act never existed.*
- v. In view of the foregoing, results and proceedings ensued in respect of Combined Competitive Examination 2018 are set aside and cancelled.*
- vi. Results of the 1,783 posts of Medical Officers & Women Medical Officers (BPS-17) purported to be appointed through advertisement dated 19.07.2018 are set aside and cancelled.*
- vii. The Petitioners, affectees and all those interested to apply to the concerned departments for the relevant Jobs after these departments place de novo advertisement in accordance with law for such appointments and the departments) to consider received applications purely on merit, following all applicable formalities.*

*These petitions along with all pending applications are disposed of in the above manner. Let a copy of this order be sent to all Heads of Departments listed in Column 4 of Schedule-1 (Rule - 3 (i) of the Sindh Government Rules of Business, 1986 forthwith and let website of the Sindh Public Service Commission (where none of the laws, rules or regulations pertaining to the Commission were made available) be immediately taken off the Internet".*

19. It, however, transpires that Regulation 161 has not been framed in accordance with the directions, reproduced above and in particular the Regulation 161 is more in favour of conferring powers on Chairman of SPSC to appoint Member (Appeals) and Appellate Committee to decide the fate of representation /appeal preferred by an aggrieved candidate. Therefore, it can be safely held that Regulation 161 is in complete violation of the well settled doctrine of justice that; **“no one can be the judge of his own cause.”** During the course of arguments, when the aforesaid position was confronted with the learned counsel representing the respondent SPSC and learned AAG, they referred Instruction 13 of the manual of General instruction of Federal Public Service Commission (FPSC) and stated that FPSC decided the representation and appeal at its own through an internal arrangement. The General Instruction 13 of FPSC reads as below:

**13. REPRESENTATION AND REVIEW PETITION:**

*a) A candidate aggrieved by any decision of the Federal Public Service Commission may within 30 days of communication of decision, make a representation to the Commission and the Commission shall decide the representation within 15 days after giving the candidate a reasonable opportunity of hearing.*

*b) A candidate aggrieved by the decision of the Commission made under Paragraph (a) may, within 15 days of communication of decision, submit a Review Petition to the Commission and the Commission shall decide the Review Petition within 30 days under the intimation to the Petitioner. The decision of the Commission on Review Petition shall be final.*

*(c) Save as provided in the ordinance, no order made or proceeding taken under this ordinance or rules made therein by the Commission shall be called in question in any court and no injunction shall be granted by any court in respect of any decision made or taken in pursuance of any power conferred by or under this ordinance.*

*(d) Any candidate aggrieved by a decision of the Commission under Paragraph (b) may within 30 days of the decision, prefer an appeal to the High Court.*

20. If General Instruction 13 of FPSC Manual and Regulation 161 of SPSC RMR are kept in juxta position, it would reveal that Regulation 161 reposes all the powers in Chairman, whereas in FPSC these powers are exercised by the commission. FPSC laws provide a right of appeal before High Court placing a judicial check on the decision of FPSC, whereas under SPSC regulations no such platform was available. In our view the Commission by exercising its powers, conferred under SPSC Act 2022, should revise the Regulation 161 and give the powers of Member (Appeals) to any member

having experience in the legal field, as the issues involved in the representations are legal in nature and can be decided comprehensively by the member having experience in said field, while the Appellate Committee should be neutral forum and in this regard the Commission may seek assistance of Law Department Government of Sindh and appoint an Appellate Committee to decide the fate of appeals, if preferred by an aggrieved candidate against orders passed on representations by the Member (Appeals).

.21. During course of arguments learned counsel for the respondent SPSC challenged the maintainability of these petitions on the ground that petitioners have not exhausted the appellate remedy. In our view, for the complete justice the doctrine of exception of remedies cannot be applied in the instant case. The Petitioners preferred representations on 13.08.2025 which were not decided within 15 days stipulated time, finding no clue or response by SPSC. Petitioner filed instant Petition on 19.08.2025 which was presented before the Court on 21.08.2025 when notices were ordered and restraining orders were passed. Since SPSC was not performing its job vigilantly therefore aggrieved persons find no alternate but to invoke the extra – ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court. Even otherwise the remedy provided under RMR 2023 was not an adequate and efficacious remedy in any manner, therefore “doctrine of exception” to avail the writ jurisdiction of this Court after exhausting statutory remedy available under RMR would not apply in matters related to SPSC. The Petitioners cannot be knocked out for not exhausting the remedy of appeal as they had the adequate and efficacious remedy before this Court, as such the Petition is held maintainable.

22. With huge reverence the case laws relied upon by Learned Counsel for Respondent were distinguishable and did not apply to the case in hand.

23. Since the respondent SPSC has made its recommendations in favour of successful candidates, through recommendation letter dated 12.08.2025, and none of the successful candidates was impleaded as party in these proceedings, therefore, grant of any relief to the petitioners at the cost of recommended candidates would amount to the violation of fundamental

rights as to fair trial guaranteed under Article 10-A of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973. Keeping in view such aspect of the case, this Court by observing reasonable restraint, deems it appropriate and well suited in the fitness of things that the representations of the petitioners should be examined afresh in true spirit of Regulation 161.

24. In wake of the above discussion, a case for indulgence and exercise of the powers of the judicial review conferred under article 199 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan of 1973 is made out. Consequently, the captioned petitions are disposed of with following manner:

- i) The orders passed by the Member (Appeals) SPSC on the representations of the petitioners are set aside and all said representation shall be deemed pending.
- ii) The petitioners, who have not earlier filed any representation may file their respective representation before the respondent SPSC within one week from the date of this Order.
- iii) The Chairman SPSC shall appoint the Member (Appeals) having hands over experience in legal field, however, other than the member, who has already acted upon the representations of the petitioner(s) in the matter.
- iv) The Member (Appeals) so appointed by the Chairman, as directed above, shall decide the representations of the petitioner in true spirit of the provisions of Regulation 161 after providing ample opportunity of hearing to all concerned in accordance with law.
- v) The Member (Appeals) shall also call the member interview panel (Dr. Mubarak Ali Jatoi) and enquire him about the irregularities during interview process, if any, and shall also compare the marking list given by the said expert/member interviewing panel with the marking incorporated in the final tabulation sheet of the candidates.
- vi) If the Member (Appeals), after completion of aforesaid exercise, finds that there are discrepancies in the markings, he/she then shall declare the final result in respect of the subject post as null and void and order for conducting fresh interviews after constitution of a new interviewer panel, comprising on members/experts duly nominated by the SPSC.
- vii) However, after examination and hearing the parities, if the Member (Appeals) finds that the result sheet

provided by expert/member (Dr. Mubarak Ali Jatoi) is according to the tabulation drawn by the SPSC, then the result and recommendation announced by the SPSC through letter dated 12.08.2025 shall be deemed to have been issued in accordance with law and the administrative department shall act accordingly.

- viii) The aforesaid exercise shall be completed within a period of 30 days from the date of this Order.

25. Office is directed to keep signed copy of the order in connected file. Office to send copy of this order to the Respondents for compliance. Additional Registrar to ensure compliance.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Sajjad Ali Jessar

Approved for reporting

Hyderabad