



cases before NIRC were found to be maintainable within their jurisdiction.

2. Being dissatisfied with this order, Respondent No. 2 filed Appeal No.12(16)/2014-K and Appeal No. 12(17)/2014-K against both the impugned orders, which were fixed before Full Bench NIRC on 18.05.2015. After preliminary hearing, the learned full bench of NIRC admitted the appeals for hearing and notices were issued to the Respondents.

3. Both the petitioners have challenged the admission orders passed by the full bench with the prayer that impugned orders may be set-aside with reconstitution of full bench. Today, Mr. Khalid Mehmood Siddiqui, learned Counsel for Respondent No.2, produced a copy of order dated 21.09.2016, passed by learned full bench of NIRC, and argued that the petitioners in these petitions have approached this Court for reconstitution of the bench and it is clearly manifesting from the order of full bench that three Members of NIRC, who admitted the appeals, have not heard the appeals of the Respondent No. 2 but in their place three other learned members have heard the appeals and set-aside the impugned orders passed in grievance petitions and found that the grievance petitions are not maintainable before the NIRC. They further directed to return the petitions to the petitioners for filing before appropriate forum.

4. It is clear from the memo of petition that both the petitioners have assailed the admission note of full bench, which has been finally decided by three other members of the NIRC; so in our view, plea of reconstitution has already served the purpose and the grievances of the petitioners have been redressed in this regard. No other ground is visible from the petition for

challenging the admission note. Of course, filing of appeal is a right conferred by law, which was exercised by Respondent No.2. At this juncture, Mr.Khalid Mehmood Siddiqui, learned advocate for Respondent No. 2 stated at bar that the full bench order has also been challenged by the petitioners in Islamabad High Court through writ petitions, which are pending and interim orders are also operating against the Civil Aviation Authority. So far as the present petitions are concerned, which were filed on a limited ground the same have already served the purpose, therefore, both petitions alongwith listed application(s) are disposed of accordingly.

Judge

Judge