

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

C. P. No. D – 2180 of 2025

[Saeed Ahmed v. Province of Sindh and others]

Before:
Justice Arbab Ali Hakro
Justice Muhammad Osman Ali Hadi

Petitioner : Saeed Ahmed, present in person

Respondents by : Mr. Shahryar Imdad Awan, Assistant Advocate General Sindh

Date of Hearing : **06.08.2026**

Date of Decision : **06.08.2026**

ORDER

ARBAB ALI HAKRO J. – This constitutional petition concerns the effect of the omission of Rule 11-A of the Sindh Civil Servants (Appointment, Promotion & Transfer) Rules, 1974 and the subsequent Notification dated 30.04.2026, which preserves all accrued rights of legal heirs of deceased civil servants prior to 26.09.2024.

2. The petitioner’s father, late Muhammad Saleem, was serving as a Cooly in the Irrigation Department, Government of Sindh, and was posted at Barrage Division, Sukkur. He died in service on 24.01.2024. The petitioner submitted an application for appointment under the deceased quota. The verification process commenced on 18.07.2024, as evidenced by the letter of the Executive Engineer, Barrage Division, Sukkur. The case was thereafter processed by the concerned authorities after verification of the documents before the cut-off date.

3. Recently, the Notification dated 30th April 2026, issued by the Services, General Administration & Coordination Department (Regulations Wing), Government of Sindh, amends the legal position created after the omission of Rule 11-A *ibid*. It expressly provides that where a right of employment had accrued prior to 26.09.2024, the legal heir shall not be deprived of the benefit accrued and shall be considered and decided at the

level of the Administrative Department, on merit and in accordance with all provisions of omitted Rule 11-A *ibid*.

4. On the admitted facts, the petitioner's father expired while in service on 24.01.2024 and the petitioner submitted his application for appointment against deceased quota, which was processed through the departmental channel prior to the cut-off date. His right, therefore, matured before the cut-off date. His case, consequently, falls squarely within the protective ambit of the saving proviso and cannot be defeated by the subsequent omission of Rule 11-A or by the interpretation rendered in **PLD 2024 SC 1276**.

5. In view of the statutory mandate contained in the Notification dated 30.04.2026, the matter is referred to the concerned Administrative Department, who shall consider and decide the petitioner's claim strictly in accordance with the saved Rule 11-A, the said Notification and the applicable service rules, by passing a reasoned, speaking order within a period not exceeding ninety (90) days, from the date of receipt of this order. With these directions, the instant petition stands **disposed of**.

6. Office is directed to communicate copy of this order to the concerned Administrative Department for compliance through all modes including electronic mode.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Abdul Basit