X Case Description Caselaw Search Search text "Exact Match" Search Statutes Search Bookmark this Case Courtwise Search 2025 SCMR 235 Station Sea Court of Pakistanl Present: Amin-ud-Din Khan, Muhammad Ali Mazhar and Irfan Saadat Khan, JJ Advarcassarchussain --- Petitioner Versus The REGIONAL POLICE OFFICER, MULTAN and another --- Respondents Case Law Search Civil Petition No. 1181-L of 2016, decided on 24th September, 2024. A Enterpression of the judgment dated 15.62120 Courassed by the Punjables of Tribunal States of Tribunal States of the Punjables of Tribunal States of Tribunal State in Appeal No. 899 of 2016). Civil service-------Departmental appeal, filing of---Limitation---Police official dismissed from service---Departmental appeal filed by police official was rejected by the competent authority for being barred by the said rejection order of the departmental appeal was maintained by the Service Thereberal vide impugned Retainment---Validity----W Neverthershow cause notice examples used to Subgregationer (prelice pifficial Count 25. Lab 20 a Chand Chard is presnaved et an ascorassed Quetla High 20 blut the petitioner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and obviously, he was not cinationsition to diligently pursue and avail the remedy of departmental appearing accordance in the remedy of departmental accordance law---Bona fides of the petitioner could not be doubted when he was incarcerated; it was not an BASHIR AHMED ANJUM VS PROVINCE OF PUNJAB through Chief SUPREMEeasy or comfortable task, rather it was beyond his control, to respond to the show cause notice, SCMR Minister Punjab, Lahore. Which was never served upon him, or to file a departmental appeal against the dismissal order, Which was never served upon him, within the stipulated time---However, when he was Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali released from jail, he immediately filed the departmental appeal which was rejected---Petitioner Mazhar then approached the Service Teilean 1 Control of the show cause notice, COURT Which was also never served upon him, within the stipulated time---However, when he was from jail, he immediately filed the departmental appeal which was rejected----Petitioner then approached the Service Tribunal for redressal of his grievance but the appeal was dismissed 2025 AMJAD ALI VS ANWAR SHAH SUPREME-Read **SCMR** Honorable Justice Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel Mazhar Alam Khan COURT 211 Miankhel Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel 2025 SHARIF AHMAD VS RASHID AHMAD SUPREME-Read **SCMR** Honorable Justice Yahya Afridi, C.J. and Malik Shahzad Ahmad Khan COURT 215 Yahya Afridi, C.J. and Malik Shahzad Ahmad Khan 2025 AYAZ VS MUSTAFA SAEED SUPREME-Read **SCMR** Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar COURT 216 Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar

Citation	Title	Court	Action
2025	TAJ WALI KHAN VS HUKAM KHAN Description	SUPREME-	Read
SCMR	Honorable Justice Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel Mazhar Alam Khan	COURT	
231	Miankhel Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel		
	Mazhar Alam Khan Miankhel	Bookmark t	his Case
2025	TASSAWAR HUSSAIN VS The REGIONAL POLICE OFFICER,	SUPREME-	Read
320121 F.S.C.	MARI 1204SN	COURT	10.000000000000000000000000000000000000
	႕ Charable Jestige Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar		
	Alwhammadali Mazhari Muhammadali Mazhazi Muhammadali Saada	t Khan, JJ	
	VMR PPUSSAIN Petitioner		
28gsus The DE	GOVERNMENT OF PUNJAB through Secretary Irrigation and Power ௸௸௵௺௸௲௵௵	SUPREME-	Read
		neeurt	
	ition Nable Westlee Mehibakhaidoding Akkle Smithig Arhie Pritnib ad maainotuhis and genent dated 15.02.2016 passed by the Punjab Se	rvica Tribuno	l Laboro
i A	1 No. 200 of 2016)	rivice illouna	ii, Lanore
2025. Civil ser	The EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (P&GS) STATE LIFE, PRINCIPAL	SUPREME-	Read
SCMR	OFFICE KARACHI VS MUHAMMAD NISAR, AREA MANAGER, dismi	COURT ssed from	service
Denai			901 1100
Depai 249 Departm	STATE LIFE CORPORATION OF PAKISTAN, PESHAWAR ZONE, ental appeal filed by police official was rejected by the compete	ent authority	for being
Depar 249 Departmo	OFFICE KARACHI VS MUHAMMAD NISAR, AREA MANAGER, rtmental appeal, filing ofLimitationPolice official dismi STATE LIFE CORPORATION OF PAKISTAN, PESHAWAR ZONE, ental appeal filed by police official was rejected by the competer view and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the departmental appear	ent authority	for being
Department Department by Service 7	STATE LIFE CORPORATION OF PAKISTAN, PESHAWAR ZONE, ental appeal filed by police official was rejected by the compete PESHAWAR y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the departmental appeal of the departmental appeal of the departmental appeal of the said rejection order. The same are considered as a supplementary when the show cause of the same are considered as a supplementary when the show cause of the same are considered as a supplementary when the show cause of the same are considered as a supplementary when the show cause of the same are considered as a supplementary when the show cause of the same are considered as a supplementary when the show cause of the same are considered as a supplementary when the s	ent authority was maintaine	for being ed by the
Department barred by Service T	STATE LIFE CORPORATION OF PAKISTAN, PESHAWAR ZONE, ental appeal filed by police official was rejected by the compete PESHAWAR y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the control of the said rejection order was much made and magnet much made and the dismissal order was some (police official) on 25 11 2010 and the dismissal order was some control of the dismissal order was some control or order was some control or of the dismissal order was some control or order was some control or order was some control or order or order was some control or order or	ent authority was maintaine se notice was	for being ed by the issued to
barred by Service 7 the petiti	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the departmental appear of the depa	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11	ed by the issued to .01.2011,
barred by Service T the petiti the petiti	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the control of the show cause of the control of the cont	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not
barred by Service I the petition the petition 2025 position.	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Fribunal vide impugned judgment—Validity—When the show caus Muhammad Ali Mazhar Marial) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was ioner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibn to Alignal Topona Alignal Ali	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not ance Reside
barred by Service I the petitithe petitithe petities 2025 positions.	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the horozope Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Fribunal vide impugned judgment—A validity—When the show cause Muhammad Ali Mazhar (police official) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was oner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh FRAILESTINESTINESTINESTINESTINESTINESTINESTIN	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he called; it w	ed by the issued to .01.2011, was not an example.
barred by Service I the petition the petition 2025 position Self-Bo 254sy or continuous self-barred by the petition of the pet	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Fribunal vide impugned judgment—Validity—When the show cause Muhammad Ali Mazhar Manazhar M	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say read of the show causting	issued to .01.2011, e was not ance anot an
barred by Service I the petition the petition 2025 position 257 position 257 position which we see the petition of the petitio	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the horosope Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Tribunal vide impugned judgment—A validity—When the show cause Muhammad Ali Mazhar	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say it was the show causest the dismis	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not ance anot an se notice, sal order,
barred by Service I the petiti the petiti 2025 positions for the petiti 2025 positions of the petitions of t	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Tribunal vide impugned judgment—A validity—When the show cause Muhammad Ali Mazhar Manazhar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muh	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he called; it was the show causet the dismis owever, when	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not ance anotice, sal order, n he was
barred by Service I the petition the petition of the petition	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Tribunal vide impugned judgment—A validity—When the show cause Muhammad Ali Mazhar Mansal appearable of the Common Ali Shah Syed Mansal Ali Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mu	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say repaired; it was the show causes the dismis owever, when a suppermetals.	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was
barred by Service I the petition the petition of the petition	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Tribunal vide impugned judgment—A validity—When the show cause Muhammad Ali Mazhar Manazhar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Marie (in connection with a murder case) and tibh Erahi Jashar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muh	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say repaired; it was the show causes the dismis owever, when a suppermetals.	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was
barred by Service I the petitical the petitical the petitical services and the petitical services are also between the petitic	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Tribunal vide impugned judgment—A validity—When the show cause with the show cause of the dismissal order was longer (police official) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was loner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tiblifer all featily for the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tiblifer all featily for the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tiblifer all featily for the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tiblifer all featily for the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tiblifer all featily for the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tiblifer all featily for the bars of the doubted when he was incated as the very served upon him, of the stipulated time—Honorable light for the bars also never served upon him, within the stipulated time—Honorable light bars also never served upon him, within the stipulated time—Honorable light bars also never served upon him, within the stipulated time—Honorable light bars also never served upon him, within the stipulated time—Honorable light bars also never served upon him, within the stipulated time—Honorable light bars also never served upon him all the bars of his grievance but the	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say repaired; it was the show causes the dismis owever, when a suppermetals.	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was
barred by Service I the petition the petition of the petition	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Tribunal vide impugned judgment—Alalidity—When the show cause Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh to the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh to the the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh to the the the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh to the the the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh to the	was maintaing se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say repaired; it was the show causes the dismis owever, when a suppermetals.	issued to issued to .01.2011, e was not an as not an se notice, sal order, n he was Petitioner
barred by Service I the petition the petition the petition of	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Tribunal vide impugned judgment—A validity—When the show cause Muhammad Ali Mazhar Police official) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was ioner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tiblifer the partitioner and the following the departmental appears of the pentitioner and the doubted when he was incated the partitioner allowed when he was incated the partitioner allowed Mansoor Ali Shah Syed Mansoor Ali Shah Shah Syed Mansoor Ali Shah Shah Syed Mansoor Ali Shah Shah Shah Shah Shah Shah Shah Sha	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say the show causet the dismist owever, where as upper was a	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was Petitigner dismissed
barred by Service I the petiti the petiti 1975 position of the petiti 1975 position of the petition of the pet	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar M	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he earlied; it was the show causes the dismis owever, where as upper was a supper w	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was
barred by Service I the petiti the petiti 1975 positi	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of Honorable Justice Munammad Ali Mazhar Washar Marier Case) and tibh to the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh to the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibh to the doubted when he was incated the said of the doubted when he was incated the said of the lastice of the doubted when he was incated the said of the lastice of the l	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say the show causet the dismist owever, where as upper was a	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was Petitigner dismissed
barred by Service I the petiti the petiti 1975 positi	y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the honorable Justice Munammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazh	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he earlied; it was the show causes the dismis owever, where as upper was a supper w	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was Petitigaer dismissed
barred by Service I the petitic the petitic 1975 positive Parks or continuous which was a south a period of the petitic 1975 and the pe	Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Iribunal vide impugned judgment. Validity - Muhammad Ali Mazhar Washar Marang Mara	was maintained se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he earlied; it was the show causest the dismission owever, where as uprementations of the short was a suprementation of the	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an se notice, sal order, n he was Petitigner dismissed
barred by Service I the petiti the petiti 2025 SCMR 2025	y Fine, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal y Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Fribunal vide impugned judgment—Validity—When the show causing the conflicted official) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was denoted as behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibn to the confliction of the confliction with a murder case one was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibn to the confliction of the confliction	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say in the show causest the dismisowever, where as upremers of the source. SUPREME-COURT	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not an ese notice, sal order, n he was Petitigner dismissed
barred by Service I the petiti the petiti I Paragraph Property of the petiti Paragraph Property of the petiti Paragraph Property of the petiti Paragraph Property of the petition of the petit	Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Firibunal vide impugned judgment—Whonorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Firibunal vide impugned judgment—Whonorable amburgment and impugned the show causing holice official) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was inner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibn to the properties of the p	was maintained se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he earlied; it was the show causest the dismission owever, where as uprementations of the short was a suprementation of the	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not ance Residhers not an se notice, sal order, he was Petitioner dismissed
barred by Service I the petitication the petitication of the petit	y Fine, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal y Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Fribunal vide impugned judgment—Validity—When the show causing the conflicted official) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was denoted as behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibn to the confliction of the confliction with a murder case one was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and tibn to the confliction of the confliction	was maintaind se notice was passed on 11 obviously, he say in the show causest the dismisowever, where as upremers of the source. SUPREME-COURT	ed by the issued to .01.2011, e was not ance e notice, sal order, n he was Petitioner dismissed

Citation	Title	Court	Action
2025 SCMR	Chaudhary GHULAM HUSSAIN VS SAUDI PAK COMMERCIAL BANK LIMITED, LAHORE	SUPREME- COURT	Read
298	Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar	Bookmark t	his Case
	MIRID 35 HAHID ZUBERI VS FEDERATION OF PAKISTAN 1- HOMOTOPOLOT JUSTICE QUET FACE ISA QAZI FACE ISA QAZI	SUPREME- COURT	Read
	মিন্দ্র বিশ্বনি বিশ্বনি ক্রিপ্রান্ত্র Muhammad Ali Mazhar and Irfan Saada	t Khan, JJ	
2725SAV SVMRUS 3719e RE	VABSHUSSAMMEREALIBANK LIMITED VS PUNJAB LABOUR APPELLATE TRIBUNAL through Chairman, Lahore GIONALIE PULICEMOFATIGE BAIMALTA MURAMINA MAZIBESPO LIMUNAN MALASIMALITA MURAMINA DELLA MURAMIN	SUPREME- COURT	Read
(Appea in Appea 2025	eaMagninst the judgment dated 15.02.2016 passed by the Punjab Seal No. 899 of 2016). MAZHAR ALI VS State	SUPREME-	Read
	Honorable Justice Malik Shahzad Ahmad Khan Malik Shahzad rtmental appeal, filing ofLimitationPolice official dism Ahmad Khan Malik Shahzad Ahmad Khan Malik Shahzad Ahmad lental appeal filed by police official was rejected by the compete Khan Malik Shahzad Ahmad Khan Malik Shahzad Ahmad Khan y time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal of the length of t		
3442 petiti in a posi	idARUBJA)cVS)TheiARDERATIONLOFOPAKISTANIIbraughaSerdetaryas idFrederalEdurationArgetarsionah TraidingvItalamaharder case) and tiUANOVANIEGURTIGARAIEARAISAAPATIEFERIERYQAZUEFERHAEARAPAP nFaffalsaGPATIEFERTRAHER could not be doubted when he was inca	l obviously, he beal in accord	e was not ance with
Schich w 34hich w released	communication of the companies of the communication of the companies of the communication of	nst the dismis owever, when as rejected	sal order n he was Petitioner
2025 SCMR	The DIRECTOR GENERAL, INTELLIGENCE BUREAU GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN VS BABAR ALI SOLANGI Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar	SUPREME- COURT	Read
353	Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar		
353 2025 SCMR 358		SUPREME- COURT	Read

Citation	Title	Court	Action		
2025 SCMR 367	The GOVERNMENT OF BALOCHISTAN, through Secretary Energy Department, Quetta VS MUHAMMAD YASIR Honorable Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar	SUPREME- COURT	Read		
00.	Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar Muhammad Ali Mazhar	Bookmark tl	his Case 🗖		
9SMPre	CMCRAIRSMAN PAKISTAN ORDNANCE FACTORIES, POF BOARD, mc/CAHIGANTFaksaki-TAR TANVEER	SUPREME- COURT	Read		
	t: Alannyahke dhatiken aye, sida Alahika washama ahalik aye shafan Malikia Waxe sheus saalik aye shara Malik	t Khan, JJ			
36jvil P	SHER AYAZ KHAN alias SHERAZ KHANA VS GUL NAJEEB KHAN EGHONALI POLICES PARTE BILLERIA SHANIA BILLA PALSAR SHAMBO BILLA BI		Read		
SCMR	beal against the judgment dated 15.02.2016 passed by the Punjab Seal TASLEEM HUSSAIN VS ALLAHDAD SHAH Honorable Justice Aqeel Ahmed Abbasi Aqeel Ahmed Abbasi Aqeel Prvice Ahmed Abbasi Aqeel Ahmed Abbasi Aqeel Ahmed Abbasi artmental appeal, filing ofLimitationPolice official dism	COURT			
_	me FARYAND ARIFILATION SOLICIF OF THE WAS rejected by the competence				
Samed	by Homor, a bled Julstice a Mulnejechisch Atim Merzhef Much depraeton Adim Mazhppre al	w @OldRaT ntaine	ed by the		
3 95 rvice	Thibunantmade Alin Mazhard Muliammad Aliv Mazhar Muliammad Aliow cau	se notice was	issued to		
the peti	tioMerharolice official) on 25.11.2010 and the dismissal order was	passed on 11	.01.2011,		
the peti	tioner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and	obviously, he	was not		
in a position to diligently pursue and avail the remedy of departmental appeal in accordance with					
	lawBona fides of the petitioner could not be doubted when he was incarcerated; it was not an easy or comfortable task, rather it was beyond his control, to respond to the show cause notice,				
	was never served upon him, or to file Madetpartmental appeal agair				
	which was also never served upon him, within the stipulated timeHowever, when he was				
	released from jail, he immediately filed the departmental appeal which was rejectedPetitioner				
	then approached the Service Tribunal for redressal of his grievance but the appeal was dismissed				
	PCrLJ Notes				

PCrLJ Notes

Journals

March		
PLD	SCMR	
CLD	PTD	
MLD	PLC	
CLC	YLR	
PCrLJ	GBLR	

Miscellaneous

Circulars
 Case Description
 General Orders
 Notifications
 Bookmark this Case ■

2025 SCMR 235

[Supreme Court of Pakistan]

New Statutes

Present: Amin-ud-Din Khan, Muhammad Ali Mazhar and Irfan Saadat Khan, JJ

TASSAWAR HUSSAIN --- Petitioner

Versus

The REGIONAL POLICE OFFICER, MULTAN and another --- Respondents

Civil Petition No. 1181-L of 2016, decided on 24th September, 2024.

Appeal against the judgment dated 15.02.2016 passed by the Punjab Service Tribunal, Lahore

in Appeal No. 899 of 2016).

Civil service---

Departmental appeal, filing of---Limitation---Police official dismissed from service---Departmental appeal filed by police official was rejected by the competent authority for being barred by time, and the said rejection order of the departmental appeal was maintained by the Service Tribunal vide impugned judgment----Validity----When the show cause notice was issued to Copyrights © 2025 by Oratier Technologies (Pvt.) Ltd. (//oratier.tech) the petitioner (police of ficial) on 25 maintained Orater Technologies (Pvt.) Ltd. (//oratier.tech) on 11.01.2011, the petitioner was behind the bars (in connection with a murder case) and obviously, he was not in a position to diligently pursue and avail the remedy of departmental appeal in accordance with law---Bona fides of the petitioner could not be doubted when he was incarcerated; it was not an easy or comfortable task, rather it was beyond his control, to respond to the show cause notice, which was never served upon him, or to file a departmental appeal against the dismissal order, which was also never served upon him, within the stipulated time---However, when he was released from jail, he immediately filed the departmental appeal which was rejected----Petitioner then approached the Service Tribunal for redressal of his grievance but the appeal was dismissed