

Order sheet  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, AT KARACHI**

**C.P No.D-5293 of 2014**

*(Pakistan Telecommunication Company Ltd. Vs. Federal Ombudsman & another)*

**For order as to maintainability**

**Date of hearing  
& order : 04.11.2025**

M/s. Zia-ul-Haq Makhdoom, Azhar Mehmood and Faisal Aziz, advocate for petitioner  
Mr. Khaleeq Ahmed, DAG and Ms. Rabia Khalid, AAG

**ORDER**

**MUHAMMAD IQBAL KALHORO, J:-** This petition has been filed by Pakistan Telecommunication Company Ltd. (**PTCL**) against a letter dated 06.02.2014 sent to it by the Federal Ombudsman referring the matter of reinstatement in service of respondent No.2, Riaz Ali Memon, for a sympathetic consideration.

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that respondent No.2 was its employee, who had resigned in the year 2012, which was accepted, and he was paid all the emoluments. However, after about one year, he filed an application before the Federal Ombudsman seeking reinstatement in service. This application was referred by the Federal Ombudsman to the petitioner for a sympathetic consideration through the impugned letter.

3. The case of the petitioner is that Federal Ombudsman has no jurisdiction in service matters, which is evident from its own letter dated 16.08.2019 (copy supplied) whereby a list of issues pertaining either to “post-retirement benefits” or “in service claims” has been given and it has been laid down that Federal Ombudsman will not have jurisdiction in these matters. Learned counsel further submits that this point that the Federal Ombudsman has no jurisdiction to entertain the service matters has already been decided by the Supreme Court in the cases of Pakistan International Airlines Corporation **vs. Fed: of Pakistan (2017 PLC (CS) 602)**, Dr. Zahid Javed **vs. Dr. Tahir Riaz Choudhry (PLD 2016 SC 637)**, Peshawar Electric Supply Company Ltd. Vs. Wafaqi Mohtsaib (Ombudsman) Islamabad **(PLD 2016 SC 940)**, Fed: of Pakistan through Secretary Revenue Division vs. Sahib Jee **(2017 PTD 1481)** and an unreported order dated 30.04.2025 passed in CP No.D-2636/2009.

4. Learned DAG has agreed with the proposition set up by the learned counsel for the petitioner in his arguments. However, he submits that since there is no final order passed by the Federal Ombudsman, this petition is not maintainable. He further submits that petitioner can decide the application of respondent No.2 on its own without a reference to the Federal Ombudsman's letter.

5. We accept the proposal of the learned DAG, although realizing the truthfulness of the proposition that Federal Ombudsman has no jurisdiction in service matters, except where malpractice is alleged. Since this is an old matter pending 2014, we expect that petitioner to decide application of respondent No.2 on its own within one month from today.

This petition is disposed of in above terms along with pending application(s).

JUDGE

JUDGE