

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PAKISTAN
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

PRESENT:

MR. JUSTICE ANWAR ZAHEER JAMALI, HCJ
MR. JUSTICE MIAN SAQIB NISAR
MR. JUSTICE AMIR HANI MUSLIM
MR. JUSTICE IQBAL HAMEEDUR RAHMAN
MR. JUSTICE KHILJI ARIF HUSSAIN

CIVIL APPEAL NO.134-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 24-03-2011 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Peshawar, in Review Petition No.103/2009 in WP. No.59/2009)

Govt. of KPK thr. Secy. Agriculture **Vs.** Adnanullah
and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.135-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 22-09-2011 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.2170/2011)

Chief Secy. Govt. of KPK & others **Vs.** Amir Hussain and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.136-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 07-03-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.1897/2011)

Govt. of KPK and others **Vs.** Muhammad Younas and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.137-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 13-03-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Abbottabad Bench, in Writ Petition No.200-A/2012)

Govt. of KPK and others **Vs.** Attaullah Khan and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.138-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 20-06-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Mingora Bench (Dar-ul-Qaza), Swat in W.P. No.189-M/2012)

Govt. of KPK thr. Secy. Agriculture **Vs.** Muhammad Ayub Khan
Livestock Peshawar and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.52-P OF 2015

(On appeal against the judgment dated 5-12-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Peshawar in Writ Petition No.3087/2011)

Govt. of KPK thr. Chief Secretary **Vs.** Qalbe Abbas and another
and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.1-P/2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 10-05-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Mingora Bench (Dar-ul-Qaza), Swat in Writ Petition No.2474/2011)

District Officer Community **Vs.** Ghani Rehman and others
Development Department (Social
Welfare) and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.133-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 17-05-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Mingora Bench (Dar-ul-Qaza), Swat, in Writ Petition No.2001/2009)

Govt. of KPK thr. Secretary **Vs.** Iftikhar Hussain and others

Livestock and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.113-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 17-05-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Mingora Bench (Dar-ul-Qaza) Swat, in Writ Petition No.2380/2009)

Govt. of KPK thr. Secretary I.T, **Vs.** Muhammad Azhar and others
Peshawar and others

CIVIL APPEAL NO.231 OF 2015

(On appeal against the judgment dated 24-04-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court, D.I.Khan Bench, in Writ Petition No.37-D/2013)

Govt. of KPK thr. Secy. Agriculture, **Vs.** Safdar Zaman and others
Livestock, Peshawar and another

CIVIL APPEAL NO.232 OF 2015

(On appeal against the judgment dated 24-04-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court, D.I.Khan Bench, in Writ Petition No.97-D/2013)

Govt. of KPK thr. Secy. Agriculture, **Vs.** Innayatullah and others
Livestock, Peshawar and another

CIVIL PETITION NO.600-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 06-06-2012 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.1818/2011)

Govt. of KPK thr. Chief Secy. and **Vs.** Noman Adil and others
others

CIVIL PETITION NO.496-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 26-06-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.1730-P/2014)

Govt. of KPK thr. Chief Secretary **Vs.** Muhammad Nadeem Jan and
Peshawar and others others

CIVIL PETITION NO.34-P OF 2015

(On appeal against the judgment dated 23-09-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.141-P/2014)

Dean, Pakistan Institute of **Vs.** Muhammad Imran and others
Community Ophthalmology (PICO),
HMC and another

CIVIL PETITION NO.526-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 12.3.2013 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.376-P/12)

Govt. of KPK through Chief **Vs.** Mst. Safia
Secretary Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.527-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 12.3.2013 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.377-P/2012)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Mst. Rehab Khattak
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.528-P OF 2013

(On appeal against the judgment dated 12-03-2013 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.378-P/2012)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Faisal Khan
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.28-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 19-09-2013 passed by the Peshawar

High Court, Mingora Bench (Dar-ul-Qaza) Swat, in Writ Petition No.4335-P/2010)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Rahimullah and others
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.214-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 30-01-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.2131-P/2013)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Mst. Fauzia Aziz
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.621-P OF 2015

(On appeal against the judgment dated 08-10-2015 passed by the Peshawar High Court, Abbottabad Bench, in Writ Petition No.55-A/2015)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Mst. Malika Hijab Chishti
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.368-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 01-04-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.351-P/2013)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Imtiaz Khan
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.369-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 01-04-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.352-P/2013)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Waqar Ahmed
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.370-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 01-04-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.353-P/2013)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Mst. Nafeesa Bibi
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.371-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 01-04-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.2454-P/2013)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Mst. Naima
Peshawar and others

CIVIL PETITION NO.619-P OF 2014

(On appeal against the judgment dated 18-09-2014 passed by the Peshawar High Court Peshawar, in Writ Petition No.2428-P/2013)

Govt. of KPK through Chief Secy. **Vs.** Muhammad Azam and others
Peshawar and others

CA.134-P/2013

For the appellant(s)

Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK
: Syed Masood Shah, SO Litigation.
Hafiz Attaul Memeen, SO. Litigation (Fin)
Muhammad Khalid, AD (Litigation)
Abdul Hadi, SO (Litigation)

For the Respondent(s)

: Mr. Imtiaz Ali, ASC

(Res. No.186, 188, 191)

: Mr. Ghulam Nabi Khan, ASC

(CMA.496-P/13)

: Mr. Ayub Khan, ASC

CA.135-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Hafiz S. A. Rehman, Sr. ASC
Mr. Imtiaz Ali, ASC

CA.136-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Hafiz S. A. Rehman, Sr. ASC
Mr. Imtiaz Ali, ASC

CA.137-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For Respondents (2 to 6) : Mr. Ijaz Anwar, ASC

CA.138-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Not represented.

CA.52-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For Respondent No.1 : In person (Absent)

For Respondent No.2 : Not represented.

CA.1-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For Respondents (1-4, 7, 8, & 10-13) : Mr. Ghulam Nabi Khan, ASC
Mr. Khushdil Khan, ASC

CA.133-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For Respondents (1-3, 5 & 7) : Mr. Ghulam Nabi Khan, ASC

For respondents (4,8,9 & 10) : Not represented.

CA.113-P/2013

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Ghulam Nabi Khan, ASC

CA.231-P/2015

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For Respondents (1-3) : Mr. Shoaib Shaheen, ASC

CA.232-P/2015

For the appellant(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For Respondent No.1 : Mr. Shoaib Shaheen, ASC

CP.600-P/2014

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Mst. Sadia Rehim (in person)

CP.496-P/2014

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK
: Noor Afzal, Director, Population Welfare
Department.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Khushdil Khan, ASC

CP.34-P/2014

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Shakeel Ahmed, ASC

For the Respondent(s) : Syed Rifaqat Hussain Shah, AOR

CPs.526 to 528-P/2013

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Ijaz Anwar, ASC

CP.28-P/2014

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Ghulam Nabi Khan, ASC
Mr. Khushdil Khan, ASC

**CPs.214-P/2014, 368-
371-P/2014 and 619-
P/2014 & 621-P/2015,**

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. AG KPK

For the Respondent(s) : Not represented.

Date of hearing : 24-02-2016

JUDGMENT

AMIR HANI MUSLIM, J.- Through this common judgment, we intend to decide the titled Appeals/Petitions, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein.

CA.134-P/2013*On Farm Water Management Project, KPK.*

2. On 27.10.2004, various posts in the “On Farm Water Management Project” were advertised. In response to the advertisement, the Respondent, Adnanullah, applied for the post of Accountant (BPS-11) for which he was selected and appointed for with effect from 31.12.2004. This appointment was initially for a period of one year and later was consistently extended from time to time on recommendation of the Petitioner. In the year 2006, a proposal was moved for creation of 302 regular vacancies to accommodate the contract employees working in different Projects. The Chief Minister KPK approved the proposal of 275 regular posts for this purpose with effect from 1.7.2007. During the interregnum, the Government of NWFP (now KPK) promulgated Amendment Act IX of 2009, thereby amending Section 19(2) of the NWFP Civil Servants Act, 1973 and NWFP Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009. However, the newly created regular posts did not include the Respondent’s post. Feeling aggrieved, he filed a Writ Petition which was allowed (on the conceding statement of Addl. Advocate General) with the direction that if the Respondent was eligible, his services should be regularized, subject to verification of his domicile. The Review Petition filed by the Govt. of KPK was dismissed being time barred. Thereafter, leave was granted in the Petition filed by the Government of KPK before this Court.

CA.No.135-P/2013 & Civil Petition No.600-P of 2013*On Farm Water Management Project, KPK*

3. On 23.06.2004, the Secretary, Agriculture, got published an advertisement in the press, inviting Applications for filling up the posts of Water Management Officers (Engineering) and Water Management

Officers (Agriculture) in BS-17, in the NWFP for the “On Farm Water Management Project” on contract basis. The Respondents applied for the said posts and in November, 2004 and February 2005 respectively, they were appointed for the aforementioned posts on contract basis, initially for a period of one year and later extendable to the remaining Project period, subject to their satisfactory performance and on the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee after completion of requisite one month pre-service training. In the year 2006, a proposal for restructuring and establishment of Regular Offices for the “On Farm Water Management Department at District level was made. A summary was prepared for the Chief Minister, KPK, for creation of 302 regular vacancies with the recommendation that eligible temporary/contract employees working on different Projects may be accommodated against regular posts on the basis of their seniority. The Chief Minister approved the summary and accordingly, 275 regular posts were created in the “On Farm Water Management Department” at District level w.e.f 01.07.2007. During the interregnum, the Government of NWFP (now KPK) promulgated Amendment Act IX of 2009, thereby amending Section 19(2) of the NWFP Civil Servants Act, 1973 and NWFP Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009. However, the services of the Respondents were not regularized. Feeling aggrieved, they filed Writ Petitions before the Peshawar High Court, praying that employees placed in similar posts had been granted relief, vide judgment dated 22.12.2008, therefore, they were also entitled to the same treatment. The Writ Petitions were disposed of, vide impugned orders dated 22.09.2011 and 06.06.2012, with the direction to consider the case of the Respondents in the light of the judgment dated

22.12.2008 and 03.12.2009. The Appellants filed Petition for leave to Appeal before this Court in which leave was granted; hence this Appeal and Petition.

C.A.No.136-P of 2013 to 138-P of 2013
On Farm Water Management Project, KPK

4. In the years 2004-2005, the Respondents were appointed on various posts on contract basis, for an initial period of one year and extendable for the remaining Project period subject to their satisfactory performance. In the year 2006, a proposal for restructuring and establishment of Regular Offices of “On Farm Water Management Department” was made at District level. A summary was prepared for the Chief Minister, KPK, for creation of 302 regular vacancies, recommending that eligible temporary/contract employees who, at that time, were working on different Projects may be accommodated against regular posts on the basis of seniority. The Chief Minister approved the proposed summary and accordingly 275 regular posts were created in the “On Farm Water Management Department” at District level w.e.f 01.07.2007. During the interregnum, the Government of NWFP (now KPK) promulgated Amendment Act IX of 2009, thereby amending Section 19(2) of the NWFP Civil Servants Act, 1973 and NWFP Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009. However, the services of the Respondents were not regularized. Feeling aggrieved, they filed Writ Petitions before the Peshawar High Court, praying therein that employees placed in similar posts had been granted relief, vide judgment dated 22.12.2008, therefore, they were also entitled to the same treatment. The Writ Petitions were disposed of, vide impugned orders dated 07.03.2012, 13.03.2012 and

20.06.2012, with the direction to consider the case of the Respondents in the light of the judgment dated 22.12.2008 and 03.12.2009. The Appellants filed Petition for leave to Appeal before this Court in which leave was granted; hence these Appeals.

Civil Petition No.619-P/2014

Establishment of Database Development Based on Electronic Tools (Project)

5. In the year 2010 and 2011, in pursuance of an advertisement, upon the recommendations of the Project Selection Committee, the Respondents were appointed as Data Base Developer, Web Designer and Naib Qasid, in the Project namely “Establishment of Data Base Development Based on Electronic Tools” including “MIS, Social Welfare and Women Development Department”, on contract basis, initially for one year, which period was extended from time to time. However, the services of the Respondents were terminated, vide order dated 04.07.2013, irrespective of the fact that the Project life was extended and the posts were brought under the regular Provincial Budget. The Respondents impugned their termination order by filing Writ Petition No.2428 of 2013, before the Peshawar High Court, which was disposed of by the impugned judgment dated 18.09.2014, holding that the Respondents would be treated at par, if they were found similarly placed, as held in judgments dated 30.01.2014 and 01.04.2014 passed in Writ Petitions No.2131 of 2013 and 353-P of 2013. The Appellants challenged the judgment of the learned High Court before this Court by filing Petition for leave to Appeal.

Civil Petitions No.368-P of 2014 to 371-P of 2014

Industrial Training Centre Garhi Shehsdad and Industrial Training Centre Garha Tajak, Peshawar

6. In the year 2008, upon the recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, after fulfilling all the codal formalities, the Respondents were appointed on contract basis on various posts in Industrial Training Centre Garhi Shehsdad and Industrial Training Centre Garha Tajak, Peshawar. Their period of contract was extended from time to time. On 04.09.2012, the Scheme in which the Respondents were working was brought under the regular Provincial Budget, but the services of the Respondents despite regularization of the Scheme were terminated vide order dated 19.06.2012. The Respondents filed Writ Petitions No.351-P, 352, 353 and 2454-P of 2013, against the order or termination and for regularization of their services on the ground that the posts against which they were appointed stood regularized and had been converted to the regular Provincial Budget, with the approval of the Competent Authority. The learned Peshawar High Court, vide common judgment dated 01.04.2014, allowed the Writ Petitions, reinstating the Respondents in Service from the date of their termination with all consequential benefits. Hence these Petitions by the Petitioners.

Civil Petition No.214-P of 2014

Welfare Home for Destitute Children, Charsadda.

7. On 17.03.2009, a post of Superintendent BS-17 was advertised for “Welfare Home for Destitute Children”, Charsadda. The Respondent applied for the same and upon recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, she was appointed at the said post on 30.04.2010, on contractual basis till 30.06.2011, beyond which period her contract was extended from time to time. The post against which the

Respondent was serving was brought under the regular Provincial Budget w.e.f 01.07.2012. However, the services of the Respondent were terminated, vide order dated 14.06.2012. Feeling aggrieved, the Respondent filed Writ Petition No.2131 of 2013, which was allowed, vide impugned judgment dated 30.01.2014, whereby it was held that the Respondent would be appointed on conditional basis subject to final decision of this apex Court in Civil Petition No.344-P of 2012. Hence this Petition by the Govt. of KPK.

Civil Petition No.621-P of 2015

Daar-ul-Aman Haripur

8. On 17.03.2009, a post of Superintendent BS-17 was advertisement for “Darul Aman”, Haripur. The Respondent applied for the said post and upon recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee she was appointed w.e.f. 30.04.2010, initially on contract basis till 30.06.2011, beyond which her period of contract was extended from time to time. The post against which the Respondent was serving was brought under the regular Provincial Budget w.e.f 01.07.2012. However, the services of the Respondent were terminated, vide order dated 14.06.2012. Feeling aggrieved, the Respondent filed Writ Petition No.55-A of 2015, which was allowed, vide impugned judgment dated 08.10.2015, holding that “*we accept this writ Petition and pass same order as has already been passed by this Court in W.P.No2131-P of 2013 decided on 30.01.2014 and direct the respondents to appoint the Petitioner on conditional basis subject to final decision of the Apex Court in Civil Petition No.344-P of 2012.*” Hence this Petition by the Govt. of KPK.

Civil Petition No.28-P of 2014*Darul Kafala, Swat.*

9. In the year 2005, the Government of KPK decided to establish Darul Kafalas in different districts of the Province between 01.07.2005 to 30.06.2010. An advertisement was published to fill in various posts in Darul Kafala, Swat. Upon recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, the Respondents were appointed on various posts on contract basis for a period of one year w.e.f 01.07.2007 to 30.06.2008, which period was extended from time to time. After expiry of the period of the Project in the year 2010, the Government of KPK has regularized the Project with the approval of the Chief Minister. However, the services of the Respondents were terminated, vide order dated 23.11.2010, with effect from 31.12.2010. The Respondents challenged the aforesaid order before the Peshawar High Court, *inter alia*, on the ground that the employees working in other Darul Kafalas have been regularized except the employees working in Darul Kafala, Swat. The Respondents contended before the Peshawar High Court that the posts of the Project were brought under the regular Provincial Budget, therefore, they were also entitled to be treated at par with the other employees who were regularized by the Government. The Writ Petition of the Respondents was allowed, vide impugned judgment dated 19.09.2013, with the direction to the Petitioners to regularize the services of the Respondents with effect from the date of their termination.

Civil Petitions No.526 to 528-P of 2013*Centre for Mentally Retarded & Physically Handicapped (MR&PH), Nowshera, and Welfare Home for Orphan Female Children Nowshera*

10. The Respondents in these Petitions were appointed on contract basis on various posts upon the recommendations of the

Departmental Selection Committee in the Schemes titled “Centre for Mentally Retarded & Physically Handicapped (MR&HP)” and “Welfare Home for Orphan Female Children”, Nowshera, vide order dated 23.08.2006 and 29.08.2006, respectively. Their initial period of contractual appointment was for one year till 30.06.2007, which was extended from time to time till 30.06.2011. By notification dated 08.01.2011, the above-titled Schemes were brought under the regular Provincial Budget of the N.W.F.P. (now KPK) with the approval of the Competent Authority. However, the services of the Respondents were terminated w.e.f 01.07.2011. Feeling aggrieved, the Respondents filed Writ Petitions No.376, 377 and 378-P of 2012, contending that their services were illegally dispensed with and that they were entitled to be regularized in view of the KPK Employees (Regularization of Services Act), 2009, whereby the services of the Project employees working on contract basis had been regularized. The learned High Court, while relying upon the judgment dated 22.03.2012, passed by this Court in Civil Petitions No.562-P to 578-P, 588-P to 589-P, 605-P to 608-P of 2011 and 55-P, 56-P and 60-P of 2012, allowed the Writ Petitions of the Respondents, directing the Petitioners to reinstate the Respondents in service from the date of their termination and regularize them from the date of their appointments. Hence these Petitions.

Civil Appeal No.52-P of 2015

11. On 23.06.2004, the Secretary, Agriculture, published an advertisement in the press, inviting Applications for filling up the posts of Water Management Officers (Engineering) and Water Management Officers (Agriculture), BS-17, in the NWFP in the “On Farm Water

Management Project” on contract basis. The Respondent applied for the said post and was appointed as such on contract basis, on the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee after completion of a requisite one month pre-service training, for an initial period of one year, extendable till completion of the Project, subject to his satisfactory performance. In the year 2006, a proposal for restructuring and establishment of Regular Offices of the “On Farm Water Management Department” at District level was made. A summary was prepared for the Chief Minister, KPK, for creation of 302 regular vacancies, recommending that eligible temporary/contract employees working on different Projects may be accommodated against regular posts on the basis of their seniority. The Chief Minister approved the summary and accordingly, 275 regular posts were created in the “On Farm Water Management Department” at District level w.e.f 01.07.2007. During the interregnum, the Government of NWFP (now KPK) promulgated Amendment Act IX of 2009, thereby amending Section 19(2) of the NWFP Civil Servants Act, 1973 and enacted the NWFP Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009. However, the services of the Respondent were not regularized. Feeling aggrieved, he filed Writ Petition No.3087 of 2011 before the Peshawar High Court, praying that employees on similar posts had been granted relief, vide judgment dated 22.12.2008, therefore, he was also entitled to the same treatment. The Writ Petition was allowed, vide impugned order dated 05.12.2012, with the direction to the Appellants to regularize the services of the Respondent. The Appellants filed Petition for leave to Appeal before this Court in which leave was granted; hence this Appeal.

Civil Appeal No.01-P of 2013

Welfare Home for Female Children, Malakand at Batkhela and Industrial Training Centre at Garhi Usman Khel, Dargai.

12. In response to an advertisement, the Respondents applied for different positions in the “Welfare Home for Female Children”, Malakand at Batkhela and “Female Industrial Training Centre” at Garhi Usman Khel. Upon the recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, the Respondents were appointed on different posts on different dates in the year 2006, initially on contract basis for a period of one year, which period was extended from time to time. However, the services of the Respondents were terminated, vide order dated 09.07.2011, against which the Respondents filed Writ Petition No.2474 of 2011, *inter alia*, on the ground that the posts against which they were appointed had been converted to the budgeted posts, therefore, they were entitled to be regularized alongwith the similarly placed and positioned employees. The learned High Court, vide impugned order dated 10.05.2012, allowed the Writ Petition of the Respondents, directing the Appellants to consider the case of regularization of the Respondents. Hence this Appeal by the Appellants.

Civil Appeals No.133-P

Establishment and Upgradation of Veterinary Outlets (Phase-III)-ADP

13. Consequent upon recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, the Respondents were appointed on different posts in the Scheme “Establishment and Up-gradation of Veterinary Outlets (Phase-III)ADP”, on contract basis for the entire duration of the Project, vide orders dated 4.4.2007, 13.4.2007. 17.4.2007 and 19.6.2007, respectively. The contract period was extended from time to time when on 05.06.2009, a

notice was served upon them, intimating them that their services were no longer required after 30.06.2009. The Respondents invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of the Peshawar High Court, by filing Writ Petition No.2001 of 2009, against the order dated 05.06.2009. The Writ Petition of the Respondents was disposed of, by judgment dated 17.05.2012, directing the Appellants to treat the Respondents as regular employees from the date of their termination. Hence this Appeal by the Appellants.

Civil Appeal No.113-P of 2013

Establishment of One Science and One Computer Lab in Schools/Colleges of NWFP

14. On 26.09.2006 upon the recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, the Respondents were appointed on different posts in the Scheme “Establishment of One Science and One Computer Lab in School/Colleges of NWFP”, on contract basis. Their terms of contractual appointments were extended from time to time when on 06.06.2009, they were served with a notice that their services were not required any more. The Respondents filed Writ Petition No.2380 of 2009, which was allowed on the analogy of judgment rendered in Writ Petition No.2001 of 2009 passed on 17.05.2012. Hence this Appeal by the Appellants.

Civil Appeals No.231 and 232-P of 2015

National Program for improvement of Water Courses in Pakistan

15. Upon the recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, the Respondents in both the Appeals were appointed on different posts in “National Program for Improvement of Water Courses in Pakistan”, on 17th January 2005 and 19th November 2005, respectively, initially on contract basis for a period of one year, which was extended

from time to time. The Appellants terminated the service of the Respondents w.e.f 01.07.2011, therefore, the Respondents approached the Peshawar High Court, mainly on the ground that the employees placed in similar posts had approached the High Court through W.Ps.No.43/2009, 84/2009 and 21/2009, which Petitions were allowed by judgment dated 21.01.2009 and 04.03.2009. The Appellants filed Review Petitions before the Peshawar High Court, which were disposed of but still disqualified the Appellants filed Civil Petitions No.85, 86, 87 and 91 of 2010 before this Court and Appeals No.834 to 837/2010 arising out of said Petitions were eventually dismissed on 01.03.2011. The learned High Court allowed the Writ Petitions of the Respondents with the direction to treat the Respondents as regular employees. Hence these Appeals by the Appellants.

Civil Petition No.496-P of 2014.

Provision of Population Welfare Programme

16. In the year 2012, consequent upon the recommendations of the Departmental Selection Committee, the Respondents were appointed on various posts in the project namely “Provision of Population Welfare Programme” on contract basis for the entire duration of the Project. On 08.01.2012, the Project was brought under the regular Provincial Budget. The Respondents applied for their regularization on the touchstone of the judgments already passed by the learned High Court and this Court on the subject. The Appellants contended that the posts of the Respondents did not fall under the scope of the intended regularization, therefore, they preferred Writ Petition No.1730 of 2014, which was disposed of, in view of the judgment of the learned High Court dated 30.01.2014 passed in Writ

Petition No.2131 of 2013 and judgment of this Court in Civil Petition No.344-P of 2012. Hence these Appeals by the Appellants.

Civil Petition No.34-P of 2015

Pakistan Institute of Community Ophthalmology Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar

17. The Respondents were appointed on various posts in the “Pakistan Institute of Community Ophthalmology Hayatabad Medical Complex”, Peshawar, in the years 2001, 2002 and from 2007 to 2012, on contract basis. Through advertisement dated 10.01.2014, the said Medical Complex sought fresh Applications through advertisement against the posts held by them. Therefore, the Respondents filed Writ Petition No.141 of 2004, which was disposed of more or less in the terms as state above. Hence this Petition.

18. Mr. Waqar Ahmed Khan, Addl. Advocate General, KPK, appeared on behalf of Govt. of KPK and submitted that the employees in these Appeals/ Petitions were appointed on different dates since 1980. In order to regularize their services, 302 new posts were created. According to him, under the scheme the Project employees were to be appointed stage wise on these posts. Subsequently, a number of Project employees filed Writ Petitions and the learned High Court directed for issuance of orders for the regularization of the Project employees. He further submitted that the concessional statement made by the then Addl. Advocate General, KPK, before the learned High Court to “adjust/regularize the petitioners on the vacant post or posts whenever falling vacant in future but in order of seniority/eligibility.” was not in accordance with law. The employees were appointed on Projects and their appointments on these Projects were to be terminated on the expiry of the Project as it was stipulated that they will not

claim any right of absorption in the Department against regular posts as per existing Project policy. He also referred to the office order dated 31.12.2004 regarding appointment of Mr. Adnanullah (Respondent in CA. No.134-P/2013) and submitted that he was appointed on contract basis for a period of one year and the above mentioned office order clearly indicates that he was neither entitled to pension nor GP Fund and furthermore, had no right of seniority and or regular appointment. His main contention was that the nature of appointment of these Project employees was evident from the advertisement, office order and their appointment letters. All these reflected that they were not entitled to regularization as per the terms of their appointments.

19. In the month of November 2006, a proposal was floated for restructuring and establishment of Regular Offices of “On Farm Water Management Department” at District level in NWFP (now KPK) which was approved by the then Chief Minister KPK; who agreed to create 302 posts of different categories and the expenditure involved was to be met out of the budgetary allocation. The employees already working in the Projects were to be appointed on seniority basis on these newly created posts. Some of the employees working since 1980 had preferential rights for their regularization. In this regard, he also referred to various Notifications since 1980, whereby the Governor KPK was pleased to appoint the candidates upon the recommendations of the KPK Public Service Commission on different Projects on temporary basis and they were to be governed by the KPK Civil Servants Act 1973 and the Rules framed thereunder. 302 posts were created in pursuance of the summary of 2006, out of which 254 posts

were filled on seniority basis, 10 through promotion and 38 by way of Court orders passed by this Court and or the learned Peshawar High Court. He referred to the case of Govt. of NWFP vs. Abdullah Khan (2011 SCMR 898) whereby, the contention of the Appellants (Govt. of NWFP) that the Respondents were Project employees appointed on contractual basis were not entitled to be regularized, was not accepted and it was observed by this Court that definition of “Contract appointment” contained in Section 2(1)(aa) of the NWFP Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009, was not attracted in the cases of the Respondent employees. Thereafter, in the case of Government of NWFP vs. Kaleem Shah (2011 SCMR 1004), this Court followed the judgment of Govt. of NWFP vs. Abdullah Khan (*ibid*). The judgment, however, was wrongly decided. He further contended that KPK Civil Servants (Amendment) Act 2005, (whereby Section 19 of the KPK Civil Servants Act 1973, was substituted), was not applicable to Project employees. Section 5 of the KPK Civil Servants Act 1973, states that the appointment to a civil service of the Province or to a civil post in connection with the affairs of the Province shall be made in the prescribed manner by the Governor or by a person authorized by the Governor in that behalf. But in the cases in hand, the Project employees were appointed by the Project Director, therefore, they could not claim any right to regularization under the aforesaid provision of law. Furthermore, he contended that the judgment passed by the learned Peshawar High Court is liable to be set aside as it is solely based on the facts that the Respondents who were originally appointed in 1980 had been regularized. He submitted that the High Court erred in regularizing the employees on the touchstone of Article 25 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan as the

employees appointed in 2005 and those in 1980 were not similarly placed and, therefore, there was no question of discrimination. According to him, they will have to come through fresh inductions to relevant posts if they wish to fall under the scheme of regularization. He further contended that any wrongful action that may have taken place previously, could not justify the commission of another wrong on the basis of such plea. The cases where the orders were passed by DCO without lawful authority could not be said to have been made in accordance with law. Therefore, even if some of the employees had been regularized due to previous wrongful action, others could not take plea of being treated in the same manner. In this regard, he has relied upon the case of Government of Punjab vs. Zafar Iqbal Dogar (2011 SCMR 1239) and Abdul Wahid vs. Chairman CBR (1998 SCMR 882).

20. Mr. Ghulam Nabi Khan, learned ASC, appeared on behalf of Respondent(s) in C.As.134-P/2013, 1-P/2013 and C.P.28-P/2014 and submitted that all of his clients were clerks and appointed on non-commissioned posts. He further submitted that the issue before this Court had already been decided by four different benches of this Court from time to time and one review petition in this regard had also been dismissed. He contended that fifteen Hon'ble Judges of this Court had already given their view in favour of the Respondents and the matter should not have been referred to this Bench for review. He further contended that no employee was regularized until and unless the Project on which he was working was not put under the regular Provincial Budget as such no regular posts were created. The process of regularization was started by the Government itself

without intervention of this Court and without any Act or Statute of the Government. Many of the decisions of the Peshawar High Court were available, wherein the directions for regularization were issued on the basis of discrimination. All the present cases before this Court are related to the category in which the Project became part of the regular Provincial Budget and the posts were created. Thousands of employees were appointed against these posts. He referred to the case of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto Vs. The State (PLD 1979 SC 741) and submitted that a review was not justifiable, notwithstanding error being apparent on face of record, if judgment or finding, although suffering from an erroneous assumption of facts, was sustainable on other grounds available on record.

21. Hafiz S. A. Rehman, Sr. ASC, appeared on behalf of Respondent(s) in Civil Appeal Nos. 135-136-P/2013 and on behalf of all 174 persons who were issued notice vide leave granting order dated 13.06.2013. He submitted that various Regularization Acts i.e. KPK Adhoc Civil Servants (Regularization of Services) Act, 1987, KPK Adhoc Civil Servants (Regularization of Services) Act, 1988, KPK Employees on Contract Basis (Regularization of Services) Act, 1989, KPK Employees on Contract Basis (Regularization of Services) (Amendment) Act, 1990, KPK Civil Servants (Amendment) Act, 2005, KPK Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009, were promulgated to regularize the services of contractual employees. The Respondents, including 174 to whom he was representing, were appointed during the year 2003/2004 and the services of all the contractual employees were regularized through an Act of legislature i.e. KPK Civil Servants (Amendment) Act, 2005 and the KPK Employees

(Regularization of Services) Act, 2009, was not applicable to present Respondents. He referred to Section 19(2) of the KPK Civil Servants Act 1973, which was substituted vide KPK Civil Servants (Amendment) Act, 2005, provides that *“A person though selected for appointment in the prescribed manner to a service or post on or after the 1st day of July, 2001, till the commencement of the said Act, but appointment on contract basis, shall, with effect from the commencement of the said Act, be deemed to have been appointed on regular basis.”* Furthermore, vide Notification dated 11.10.1989 issued by the Government of NWFP, the Governor of KPK was pleased to declare the “On Farm Water Management Directorate” as an attached Department of Food, Agriculture, Livestock and Cooperation Department, Govt. of NWFP. Moreover, it was also evident from the Notification dated 03.07.2013 that 115 employees were regularized under section 19 (2) of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Civil Servants (Amendment) Act, 2005 and Regularization Act, 2009 from the date of their initial appointment. Therefore, it was a past and closed transaction. Regarding summaries submitted to the Chief Minister for creation of posts, he clarified that it was not one summary (as stated by the learned Addl. Advocate General KPK) but three summaries submitted on 11.06.2006, 04.01.2012 and 20.06.2012, respectively, whereby total 734 different posts of various categories were created for these employees from the regular budgetary allocation. Even through the third summary, the posts were created to regularize the employees in order to implement the judgments of Hon’ble Peshawar High Court dated 15.09.2011, 8.12.2011 and Supreme Court of Pakistan dated 22.3.2012. Approximately, 20-30% employees were

recruited through KPK Public Service Commission and the Public Service Commission is only meant to recommend the candidates on regular posts.

22. Mr. Imtiaz Ali, learned ASC, appearing on behalf of the Respondent in CA No.134-P/2013, submitted that there was one post of Accountant which had been created and that the Respondent, Adnanullah, was the only Accountant who was working there. He contented that, even otherwise, judgment dated 21.9.2009 in Writ Petition No.59/2009, was not questioned before this Court and the same had attained finality. He further submitted that his Writ Petition was allowed on the strength of Writ Petition No. 356/2008 and that no Appeal has been filed against it.

23. Mr. Ayub Khan, learned ASC, appeared in C.M.A 496-P/2013 on behalf of employees whose services might be affected (to whom notices were issued by this Court vide leave granting order dated 13.06.2013) and adopted the arguments advanced by the senior learned counsels including Hafiz S. A. Rehman.

24. Mr. Ijaz Anwar, learned ASC, appeared in C.A 137-P/2013 for Respondents No. 2 to 6, CPs.526-P to 528-P/2013 for Respondents and for Appellant in Civil Appeal No.605-P/2015 (JR) and submitted that the Regularization Act of 2005, is applicable to his case and if benefit is given to some employees then in light of the judgment of this Court titled Government of Punjab Vs. Samina Perveen (2009 SCMR 1), wherein it was observed that if some point of law is decided by Court relating to the terms and conditions of a Civil Servant who litigated and there were other who had not taken any legal proceedings, in such a case the dictates of justice

and rules of good governance demand that the benefit of the said decision be extended to others also who may not be parties to that litigation. Furthermore, the judgment of Peshawar High Court which included Project employees as defined under Section 19(2) of the KPK Civil Servants Act 1973 which was substituted vide KPK Civil Servants (Amendment) Act, 2005, was not challenged. In the NWFP Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009, the Project employees have been excluded but in presence of the judgment delivered by this Court, in the cases of Govt. of NWFP vs. Abdullah Khan (*ibid*) and Govt. of NWFP vs. Kaleem Shah (*ibid*), the Peshawar High Court had observed that the similarly placed persons should be considered for regularization.

25. While arguing Civil Appeal No. 605-P/2015, he submitted that in this case the Appellants/ Petitioners were appointed on contract basis for a period of one year vide order dated 18.11.2007, which was subsequently extended from time to time. Thereafter, the services of the Appellants were terminated vide notice dated 30.05.2011. The learned Bench of the Peshawar High Court refused relief to the employees and observed that they were expressly excluded from the purview of Section 2(1)(b) of KPK (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009. He further contended that the Project against which they were appointed had become part of regular Provincial Budget. Thereafter, some of the employees were regularized while others were denied, which made out a clear case of discrimination. Two groups of persons similarly placed could not be treated differently, in this regard he relied on the judgments of Abdul Samad vs.

Federation of Pakistan (2002 SCMR 71) and Engineer Nariandas vs. Federation of Pakistan (2002 SCMR 82).

26. We have heard the learned Law Officer as well as the learned ASCs, representing the parties and have gone through the relevant record with their able assistance. The controversy in these cases pivots around the issue as to whether the Respondents are governed by the provisions of the North West Frontier Province (now KPK) Employees (Regularization of Services) Act, 2009, (hereinafter referred to as the Act). It would be relevant to reproduce Section 3 of the Act:

“3. Regularization of Services of certain employees.—All employees including recommendees of the High Court appointed on contract or adhoc basis and holding that post on 31st December, 2008, or till the commencement of this Act shall be deemed to have been validly appointed on regular basis having the same qualification and experience.”

27. The aforesaid Section of the Act reproduced hereinabove clearly provides for the regularization of the employees appointed either on contract basis or adhoc basis and were holding contract appointments on 31st December, 2008 or till the commencement of this Act. Admittedly, the Respondents were appointed on one year contract basis, which period of their appointments was extended from time to time and were holding their respective posts on the cut-of date provided in Section 3 (*ibid*).

28. Moreover, the Act contains a non-obstante clause in Section 4A which reads as under:

“4A. Overriding effect.—Notwithstanding any thing to the contrary contained in any other law or

rule for the time being in force, the provisions of this Act shall have an overriding effect and the provisions of any such law or rule to the extent of inconsistency to this Act shall cease to have effect.”

29. The above Section expressly excludes the application of any other law and declares that the provisions of the Act will have overriding effect, being a special enactment. In this background, the cases of the Respondents squarely fall within the ambit of the Act and their services were mandated to be regulated by the provisions of the Act.

30. It is also an admitted fact that the Respondents were appointed on contract basis on Project posts but the Projects, as conceded by the learned Additional Advocate General, were funded by the Provincial Government by allocating regular Provincial Budget prior to the promulgation of the Act. Almost all the Projects were brought under the regular Provincial Budget Schemes by the Government of KPK and summaries were approved by the Chief Minister of the KPK for operating the Projects on permanent basis. The “On Farm Water Management Project” was brought on the regular side in the year 2006 and the Project was declared as an attached Department of the Food, Agriculture, Livestock and Co-operative Department. Likewise, other Projects were also brought under the regular Provincial Budget Scheme. Therefore, services of the Respondents would not be affected by the language of Section 2(aa) and (b) of the Act, which could only be attracted if the Projects were abolished on the completion of their prescribed tenure. In the cases in hand, the Projects initially were introduced for a specified time whereafter they were transferred on permanent basis by attaching them with Provincial

Government departments. The employees of the same Project were adjusted against the posts created by the Provincial Government in this behalf.

31. The record further reveals that the Respondents were appointed on contract basis and were in employment/service for several years and Projects on which they were appointed have also been taken on the regular Budget of the Government, therefore, their status as Project employees has ended once their services were transferred to the different attached Government Departments, in terms of Section 3 of the Act. The Government of KPK was also obliged to treat the Respondents at par, as it cannot adopt a policy of cherry picking to regularize the employees of certain Projects while terminating the services of other similarly placed employees.

32. The above are the reasons of our short order dated 24.2.2016, which reads as under:-

“Arguments heard. For the reasons to be recorded separately, these Appeals, except Civil Appeal No.605 of 2015, are dismissed. Judgment in Civil Appeal No.605 of 2015 is reserved”

Chief Justice

Judge

Judge

Judge

Judge

Islamabad the,
24-02-2016
 Approved for reporting.