## ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Const. Petition No.D-27 of 2020

Date	Order with signature of Judge

1. For orders on office objection at flag `A`

2. For hearing of main case

31-08-2023

Mr. J.K.Jarwar, Advocate for the Petitioner Mr. Khan Muhammad Sangi, Advocate for Respondent No.4 Mr. Ashfaque Hussain Abro, Assistant Attorney General

**Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro,J:-** It is claimed that the petitioner was appointed as Mali on contract basis for three months in Inland Revenue (HRM) at regional Tax Office Sukkur on 26.07.2017. His tenure was thereafter extended and he completed three spells of three months and then was terminated instead of being regularized in terms of a decision of cabinet committee dated 29.02.2012, hence, he has filed this petition for the same relief.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that some of the employees, who likewise the petitioner were appointed on contract basis, when not regularized, filed a petition No.D-3913/2015 and this court on 26.03.2019 ordered for their regularization of service in view of the decision of cabinet committee, hence petitioner is entitled to identical treatment and his service may be regularized.

The arguments from other side is that the petitioner had completed only two spells of 3 months and was terminated, so the decision of cabinet committee envisaging 3 spells of such term is not applicable to him. More so, this policy is applicable to the employees who were appointed prior to the cutoff date i.e. 29.02.20212 which is clearly mentioned in para No.2 of the minutes of the meeting. The decision of this court in earlier petition is based on the fact that all the petitioners were appointed prior to 29.02.2012 and had completed one year or three spells of 89 days as contract employees. Whereas the petitioner was appointed in 2017, hence the decision of cabinet committee is not applicable to his case, and in addition he had not completed three spells of 89 days. In rebuttal nothing has been offered, even this has not been suggested or any document produced that the petitioner had in fact completed three spells of three months except that a

Notification of his termination was issued after nine months which does not mean that his tenure was extended three times. Nothing has been offered either to the counter claim of the respondents that the decision of cabinet committee is applicable to the employees who were appointed before 29.02.2012 and had completed either one year of contractual employment or three spells of 89 days till that date which, in our view, appears to be the case and correct position. This being the position, we find no merits in the case and accordingly dismiss it.

JUDGE

JUDGE

#### ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Const. Petition No.D-96 of 2020

Date Order with signature of Judge

For hearing of main case

#### <u>31-08-2023</u>

Mr. Mehboob Ali Wassan, Assistant Advocate General

Respondents No.4 files comments, which are taken on record. No one is present on behalf of the petitioner. Adjourned to **01.11.2023.** 

JUDGE

JUDGE

## ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Const. Petition No.D-609 of 2020

Date	Order with signature of Judge
	<ol> <li>For orders on office objection at flag `A`</li> </ol>
	2 For orders on CMA No 2014/2020

For orders on CMA No.2814/2020
 For hearing of main case

<u>31-08-2023</u>

Mr. Asfand Yar Kharal, Assistant Advocate General

Syd Israr Shah holding brief for Mr. Mir Nawaz Kalhoro Advocate for the petitioner seeks time on the ground that the latter is busy before another bench of this court. Adjourned as a last chance.

JUDGE

JUDGE

#### ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Const. Petition No.D-1073 of 2020

Date	Order with signature of Judge	

1. For orders on office objection at flag `A`

2. For hearing of main case

31-08-2023

Mr. Ashfaque Hussain Abro, Assistant Attorney General

Gulshan Ahmed holding brief for Mr. Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro Advocate for the petitioner seeks time on the ground that the latter is busy before another bench of this court. Adjourned to **01.11.2023.** 

JUDGE

JUDGE

#### ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Cr. Suo- Moto Revision No.D-03 of 2021

Date Order with signature of Judge

For hearing of main case

31-08-2023

Mr. Farhan Ali Shaikh, Advocate for Respondents No.6 to 11 Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Jatoi, Additional Prosecutor General

Gulshan Ahmed holding brief for Mr.Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro Advocate for respondents No.1 to 4 seeks time on the ground that the latter is busy before another bench of this court. Adjourned to **17.10.2023**.

JUDGE

JUDGE

#### ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Const. Petition No.D-34 of 2021

Date	Date Order with signature of Judge	
	<ol> <li>For orders on office objection at flag `A`</li> <li>For hearing of main case</li> </ol>	

31-08-2023

Mr. Ihsan Ali Lund Baloch, Advocate for the petitioner Mr. Ali Raza Baloch, Assistant Advocate General Hamid Ali Secretary UC Kotri Muhammad Kabir

Petitioner is working as Junior clerk in UC Kotri Muhammad Kabir and has filed this petition for release of differential amount in respect of his salary. It is stated that entire differential amount has been paid to the petitioner except Rs.39212/-, which will be paid to him in coming month. Counsel for the petitioner is satisfied, hence this petition is disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

### ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Cr. Appeal No.D-63 of 2021 Confirmation Case No.12 of 2021

Date	Order with signature of Judge

- 1. For orders on office objection at flag `A`
- 2. For orders on MA No.4779/2021
- 3. For hearing of main case

31-08-2023

# Mr. Aftab Ahmed Shar, Additional Prosecutor General

It appears from the record that no one is appearing on behalf of the appellant. In these circumstances office, to write letter to Jail Superintendent with direction to ask the appellant to engage some counsel to proceed with this matter, else counsel on state expenses would be provided to him. Adjourned.

Office is directed to place a signed copy of this order in the captioned connected matter.

JUDGE

JUDGE

#### ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Const. Petition No.D-553 of 221

Date	Order with signature of Judge

1. For orders on office objection at flag `A`

2. For hearing of main case

31-08-2023

Mr. Safandyar Kharal, Assistant Advocate General

None present for the petitioner, no intimation received. We have seen that on most of the dates the petitioner and his counsel remained absent. Accordingly this petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

JUDGE

JUDGE

### ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR Const. Petition No.D-1029 of 2021

Date Order with signature of Judge

For hearing of main case

#### 31-08-2023

Syed Zaffar Ali Shah Bukhari, Advocate for the Petitioner Mr. Ghulam Abbas, Associate of Mr. Khuda Bux Chohan Advocate for Respondents No.2 & 3 Mr. Ali Raza Baloch, Assistant Advocate General

Counsel for petitioner files rejoinder against the objections of respondents No.2 & 3. A copy whereof he shares with other side. Adjourned to **12.10.2023.** 

JUDGE

JUDGE