

**HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,
MIRPURKHAS**

Before:

**Justice Muhammad Osman Ali Hadi
Justice Muhammad Jaffer Raza**

C.P No.D-560 of 2026

[Uzma v. Province of Sindh and others]

Petitioner by : Ms. Shumaila Naz, Advocate.

Respondents by : Mr. Shareef Solangi, Assistant A.G Sindh.

Date of Hearing : **17.06.2026**

Date of Decision : **17.06.2026**

ORDER

The instant 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 husband namely Saeed Ahmed Malkani was serving as Lab Assistant in Taluka Education Officer, Taluka Sindhri and expired during service on 20.12.2023, which fact is reflected in the obituary issued by the department dated 22.01.2024. The petitioner applied for appointment against deceased quota and her application was submitted on 13.09.2024. His case was processed and forwarded through the proper administrative channel before 26.09.2024.

3. Learned A.A.G Sindh is present in court in some other cases, waived the notice and submits that he has no objection if the petition is disposed of with directions to the concerned Administrative Department to consider and

decide the petitioner's claim strictly in accordance with law and the Notification dated 30.04.2026.

4. 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*.

5. On the admitted facts, the petitioner's rights matured before the cut-off date. Her case, therefore, 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**.

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

The office is directed to communicate a copy of this order to the concerned Administrative Department for compliance through all modes, including e-service.

JUDGE

JUDGE