

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH,**  
**Bench at Sukkur**

**C. P. No. D – 1923 of 2011**

**For Direction**

For hearing of CMA 237/2014(C/A)

**03-11-2022**

Mr. Irfan Ali Soomro, Advocate for the petitioners.  
Mr. Muhammad Imran Khan, Advocate for respondents-Pakistan Railways.  
Mr. Ashfaq Hussain Abro, Assistant Attorney General.

**ORDER**

Through instant Constitution Petition, the Petitioners sought regularization of their services in Pakistan Railways.

By means of listed application, the petitioners seek initiation of contempt proceedings against alleged contemnor for allegedly willful disobedient of the order dated 18.09.2013 passed by this Court, whereby the observation was made that the respondents can consider the prayer/request of the petitioners if, they are eligible and fulfill the necessary requirements and if, there is no bar or impediment on such consideration. In case the petitioners are not found by the respondents to be entitled for any relief, then appropriate orders shall be passed by the respondents within a period of two months of receipt of this order.

It is an admitted position that compliance of this order has been made by the respondents. The case of the petitioners was considered for their regularization and as they could not substantiate their claim of having three years TLA service, they could not be considered fit for regularization of their services.

Learned counsel for the petitioners concedes the fact that compliance of the order has been made; however, he pleads that the services of the petitioners were more than three years, but it was wrongly held by the competent authority of the Pakistan Railways that the services of the petitioners were less than three years.

Admittedly the order, whereby instant petition was disposed of by this Court, has been complied with by the respondents. However, the plea of learned counsel for the petitioners that the services of the petitioners were more than three years, but length of service of the petitioners was wrongly considered to be less than three years by the respondents, is a disputed fact. Moreover, comments filed by the respondents and accompanying documents reflects that either the petitioners remained absent from their duties or they did not apply for their regularization of services. Hence, listed application being devoid of any merit stands **dismissed** accordingly.

**J U D G E**

**J U D G E**

Ahmad