

HIGH COURT OF AZAD JAMMU & KASHMIR

1. Writ petition No. 2111/2018
Date of institution 04.12.2018
Date of decision 07.07.2022

Hafiz Rashid Jamil, Private Secretary B-17, Ehtesab Bureau of Azad Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad.

Petitioner

VERSUS

1. Ehtesab Bureau through its Chairman having office at Old Court Road near Madina Market, Muzaffarabad;
2. Public Service Commission of Azad Jammu & Kashmir through its Secretary having office at Old President Secretariat near Narrul Stadium Jalalabad, Muzaffarabad;
3. Services and General Administration Department through its Secretary having office at New Secretariat Muzaffarabad.

Respondents

2. Writ petition No. 2125/2018
Date of institution 05.12.2018

Abdul Qadeer Qazi, Assistant Director B-17, Ehtesab Bureau of Azad Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad.

Petitioner

VERSUS

1. Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir through its Chief Secretary having his office at New Secretariat Muzaffarabad;
2. Ehtesab Bureau through its Chairman having office at Old Court Road near Madina Market Muzaffarabad;
3. Public Service Commission of Azad Jammu & Kashmir through its Secretary having office at Old President Secretariat near Narrul Stadium, Jalalabad, Muzaffarabad;

4. Services and General Administration Department through its Secretary having office at New Secretariat Muzaffarabad.

Respondents

3. Writ petition No. 1825/2020
Date of institution 17.12.2020

1. Awais Rafique, Deputy Director (Investigation/Admin)/ DDO BPS-18, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau, Muzaffarabad;
2. Haroon Rasheed, Deputy Director (Investigation/ Complaint) BPS-18, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau Muzaffarabad.

Petitioners

VERSUS

1. Chairman Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau having his office at New Secretariat Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
2. Selection Board No.1 through its Chairman (Chairman Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau) having his office at New Secretariat Muzaffarabad;
3. Secretary Law, Justice, Parliamentary Affairs and Human Rights AJ&K Govt. office at New Secretariat Muzaffarabad;
4. Director Administration Ehtesab Bureau of Azad Jammu & Kashmir having his office at New Secretariat Muzaffarabad;
5. Atta-ur-Rehman Superintendent Police on deputation in Ehtesab Bureau Azad Jammu & Kashmir;
6. Accountant General of Azad Jammu & Kashmir having his office at Sathra Muzaffarabad.

Respondents

4. Writ petition No. 1849/2020
Date of institution 22.12.2020

Arslan Ahmed, Deputy Director (Investigation/Complaints),
Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau Mirpur Azad
Kashmir.

Petitioner

VERSUS

1. Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau through
Chairman Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau
Muzaffarabad;
2. Chairman, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau
Muzaffarabad;
3. Law, Justice, Parliamentary Affairs and Human Rights
Department, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu &
Kashmir through Secretary Law, Justice, Parliamentary
Affairs and Human Rights Department, Azad Govt. of
the State of Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad;
4. Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir through
Chief Secretary to Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu &
Kashmir Muzaffarabad;
5. Azad Jammu & Kashmir Public Service Commission
through Chairman Azad Jammu & Kashmir Public
Service Commission Muzaffarabad;
6. Mr. Saleem Mehmood, PDSP Police Department, Azad
Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad;
7. Home Department, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu
& Kashmir through Secretary Home Department, Azad
Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad.

Respondents

5. Writ petition No. 1878/2020
Date of institution 23.12.2020

1. Jamil Ahmed Khan;
2. Javed Akhtar, Senior Clerks, presently officiating
Head Clerks B-16;
3. Shahid Saddique;
4. Muhammad Haroon;
5. Zafar Iqbal;
6. Abdul Hafeez;
7. Attique-ur-Rehman;
8. Muhammad Amjad, Senior Clerk B-14;

9. Malik Allah Ditta, Reader B-07, presently officiating Senior Clerk B-14;
10. Tasleem Arif Khan;
11. Adnan Hanif, Junior Clerks B-11 presently officiating Senior Clerk B-14;
12. Muhammad Safeer Sheikh, Naib Qasid presently officiating Junior Clerk B-11, all employees of Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau at Muzaffarabad Azad Kashmir.

Petitioners

VERSUS

1. Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir through Secretary Law, Justice, Parliamentary Affairs and Human Rights Department, having office at Civil Secretariat Muzaffarabad;
2. Ehtesab Bureau Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Azad Govt. through Chairman Ehtesab Bureau having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
3. Chairman, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
4. Secretary Law, Justice, Parliamentary Affairs and Human Rights Department, Azad Govt. having office at Civil Secretariat Chatter Muzaffarabad;
5. Secretary Services and General Administration Department, Azad Govt. having office at Civil Secretariat Chatter Muzaffarabad;
6. Director Co-ordination Ehtesab Bureau having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
7. Director Administration Ehtesab Bureau having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
8. Deputy Director Administration, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad Azad Kashmir;
9. Assistant Director Administration, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad Azad Kashmir;
10. Committee for scrutiny of cases/status of employees of Ehtesab Bureau constituted through order No.1635-40 dated 20.11.2020, through its Chairman, Director Legal Ehtesab Bureau having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
11. Departmental Selection Committee No.1 Ehtesab Bureau through its Chairman (Chairman Azad Jammu

- & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau), having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
12. Departmental Selection Committee No.2 Ehtesab Bureau, through its Chairman (Director Administration Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau) having office at Thoori Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
 13. Accounts Officer Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau, having office at Thoori, Lower Chatter Muzaffarabad;
 14. Accountant General Azad Govt. having office at Sathra Hills Muzaffarabad.

Respondents

6. Writ petition No. 07/2021
Date of institution 01.01.2021

1. Naveed-ur-Rehman, Data Entry Operator B-12;
2. Mushtaq Ahmed, Stenographer B-14, presently officiating Senior Scale Stenographer B-16;
3. Muhammad Nadeem, Stenographer B-14 presently officiating Senior Scale Stenographer B-16;
4. Syed Abdul Jabbar Bukhari, Stenographer B-14;
5. Mir Afzal, Stenographer B-14;
6. Muhammad Asim Awan, Stenographer B-14;
7. Moheed Gillani, Dispatch Rider B-5;
8. Muhammad Maqbool Khan, Driver B-5;
9. Raja Hashmat Ali Khan, Driver B-5;
10. Amjad Manzoor, Driver B-5;
11. Raja Zulfiqar, Driver B-5;
12. Shahzad Mehmood, Driver B-5;
13. Sajjad Hussain, Driver B-5;
14. Amjad Shabbir, Driver B-5;
15. Ansar Mehmood, Driver B-5;
16. Arif Hussain Shah, Naib Qasid B-2;
17. Muhammad Manzoor, Naib Qasid B-2;
18. Asad Aziz, Naib Qasid B-2;
19. Muhammad Naseem, Naib Qasid B-2;
20. Qazi Ghulam Murtaza, Naib Qasid B-2;
21. Muhammad Matloob, Naib Qasid B-2;
22. Muhammad Rashid, Naib Qasid B-2;
23. Waqas Akbar, Naib Qasid B-2;
24. Sajid Mehmood, Naib Qasid B-2;
25. Muhammad Azam, Naib Qasid B-2;
26. Muhammad Akram, Naib Qasid B-2;

27. Muhammad Ramzan, Naib Qasid B-2;
28. Muhammad Waqas, Naib Qasid B-2;
29. Muhammad Nawaz, Chowkidar B-2;
30. Muhammad Maroof, Chowkidar B-2;
31. Raja Muhammad Fayyaz, Chowkidar B-2;
32. Muhammad Imran, Gardner B-2;
33. Muhammad Imran S/o Muzaffar Khan, Gardner B-2;
34. Rehmat-Ullah, Cook B-2;
35. Malik Zulfiqar Awan, Cook B-2;
36. Muhammad Khalid, Cook B-2, all employees of Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau Muzaffarabad.

Petitioners

VERSUS

1. Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau through Chairman Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau Muzaffarabad;
2. Chairman, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau Muzaffarabad;
3. Director Administration, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau Muzaffarabad;
4. Services and General Administration Department Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir through Secretary Services and General Administration Department, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad;
5. Law, Justice, Parliamentary Affairs and Human Rights Department, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir through Secretary Law, Justice, Parliamentary Affairs and Human Rights Department, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad;
6. Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir through Chief Secretary to Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir Civil Secretariat Muzaffarabad;
7. Selection Committee for appointment/promotion to posts in BPS-1 to BPS-15, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau Muzaffarabad.

Respondents

7. Writ petition No. 70/2021
Date of institution 08.01.2021

Zulqarnain S/o Munshi Khan, Additional Director Legal
Ehtesab Bureau of Azad Jammu & Kashmir Muzaffarabad.

Petitioner

VERSUS

1. Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau through
Chairman Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau
Muzaffarabad;
2. Chairman, Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau
Muzaffarabad;
3. Selection Board No.1 through its Secretary, Director
Admin, Ehtesab Bureau Muzaffarabad;
4. Assistant Director Admin, Ehtesab Bureau;
5. Syed Saleem Hussain Gardezi, Director Complaints/
Admin of Azad Jammu & Kashmir Ehtesab Bureau
Muzaffarabad.

Real Respondents

6. Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir through
Secretary Services and General Administration.

Proforma Respondent

WRIT PETITIONS

BEFORE: _____ *Justice Sadaqat Hussain Raja, C.J.*
Justice Sardar Liaqat Hussain, J.
Justice Syed Shahid Bahar, J.

PRESENT:

M/s Mr. Abdul Rasheed Abbasi, Mr. Asghar Ali Malik,
Sardar Waheed Arif, Mr. Saqib Javed, Mr. Yasir Hashmi and
Ch. Ghulam Nabi, Advocates for the petitioners.

Raja Anjum Feroz, Deputy Chief Prosecutor Ehtesab Bureau;
M/s Mr. Fayyaz Khan and Mr. Abid Qayyum Mughal,
Prosecutors Ehtesab Bureau.

JUDGMENT:

(Justice Syed Shahid Bahar, J) The instant writ petitions have been filed under Article 44 of the Azad Jammu and Kashmir Interim Constitution, 1974.

As common questions of fact and law are involved in all the above titled writ petitions, hence, were heard together and decided as such through this single judgment in view of Rule 11 sub-rule (2) of the Azad Jammu & Kashmir High Court Procedure Rules, 1984.

In Writ Petition No.2111/2018, following relief has been solicited by the petitioner:-

“In view of abovementioned averments, it is, therefore, prayed on behalf of the petitioner that by accepting the instant constitutional petition, respondents may kindly be directed to restrain from conducting the selection process and filling the post of Private Secretary BPS-17 advertised through advertisement No.07/2018 issued by the Public Service Commission on the requisition of Ehtesab Bureau by declaring the same already filled by the petitioner in accordance with rule of law, not vacant available for fresh recruitment. Any other relief which this Hon’ble Court deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case may very kindly be granted in favour of the petitioner.”

In Writ Petition No. 2125/2018, the petitioner solicited the following relief:-

“In the circumstances which are enumerated above, it is, therefore, very humbly prayed that the instant petition may kindly be accepted and an appropriate writ may kindly be issued in favor of the petitioners whereby the impugned order passed by respondent No.1 bearing No.EB/Admin/1804-1820/2020 dated 11.12.2020 may kindly be declared against law, facts and record, based on malafide, illegal exercise of jurisdiction, without lawful authority and of no legal effect be quashed/set aside to the extent of clause (ii) and (iv). Respondents be restrained from taking any step in consequence of these illegal order. Any other relief which this Hon’ble Court deems fit may also be granted in favour of the petitioners to meet the ends of justice.”

Following relief is also implored by the petitioner in Writ Petition No.1849/20:-

“It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that by accepting the writ petition, appropriate writs may very kindly be issued:-

- (i) declaring the order dated 11.12.2020 to the extent of termination of services of the petitioner as without lawful authority and of no legal effect which may kindly be aside the accordingly:
 - (ii) restraining the respondents from relieving the petitioner or terminating the services of the petitioner as Deputy Director Investigation/Complaints till completion of process of selection by the AJ&K Public Service Commission.
- Any other relief which the Hon’ble Court deems fit, may also very kindly be granted to the petitioner along with costs of the writ petition.”

Whereas, in Writ Petition No.1878/20, the relief has been claimed by the petitioners as under:-

“In view of the above, it is therefore, most humbly prayed on behalf of the petitioners that by accepting the petition, following writs may kindly be issued:-

- (i) while declaring the orders dated 20.11.2020, 11.12.2020 and advertisement dated 18.12.2020 to the extent of posts of Head Clerks B-16, Senior Clerks B-14, Junior Clerks B-11, Reader B-7, Naib Qasids B-1, discriminatory, against law, rules, principles of natural justice, constitution and judgments/orders of Hon’ble Supreme Court, the same may kindly be set-aside;
- (ii) while directing the respondents to treat the petitioners as permanent employees of Ehtesab Bureau they (respondents) may kindly be restrained from disturbing or terminating the services of the petitioners;
- (iii) Any other relief if the Hon’ble Court deem proper may also be granted in the interest of justice.”

While the petitioners also sought the following relief through Writ Petition No.07/2021:-

“It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that by accepting the writ petition, appropriate writs may very kindly be issued:-

- (i) declaring the order dated 11.12.2020 to the extent of clause (iii) as well as advertisement published by respondent No.3 in the Daily “The Mohasib” dated 18.12.2020 for recruitment against the posts

- held by the petitioners as without lawful authority and of no legal effect;
- (ii) restraining the respondents from disturbing the petitioners from their appointments/posts held by them as mentioned in the title of the petition; and
 - (iii) restraining the respondents from taking any adverse action against the petitioners under the Ehtesab Bureau Rules, 2017 by applying the said rules retrospectively to the appointments of the petitioners made during the period 2000-2008 and made regular on the recommendations of the Selection Committee concerned in the year 2010;
- Any other relief which the Hon'ble Court deems fit, may also very kindly be granted to the petitioners along with costs of the writ petition."

Lastly, through Writ Petition No.70/2021, following relief is also implored by the petitioner:-

"Under the circumstances, it is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this petition may kindly be accepted and impugned order dated 23.12.2020 may graciously be declared as illegal, unlawful and without having any legal effect and consequently same be set-aside in the supreme interest of justice;

Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper be awarded in favour of the petitioner."

The writ petitions have been resisted by the respondents by filing written statement, wherein the claim of the petitioners has also been refuted in toto and prayed for dismissal of the instant writ petitions.

The learned counsel for the parties reiterated the facts and grounds as taken in the writ petitions as well as in

the written statement, therefore, there is no need to reproduce the same.

We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

Without dilating upon the merits and demerits of the case, suffice it to observe that the petitioners have challenged the impugned orders dated 11.12.2020, 20.11.2020 and 23.12.2020 which have been issued without lawful authority. A further direction is also beseeched from the respondents to treat the petitioners as permanent employees of Ehtesab Bureau and not to disturb or terminate the services of the petitioners. It is pertinent to mention here that in a case titled “*Sardar Muhammad Razzaq Vs. Chairman Ehtesab Bureau of Azad Jammu & Kashmir and 4 others*” [2015 SCR 1156], the Hon’ble Apex Court of Azad Jammu & Kashmir has resolved the same controversy. It is more advantageous to reproduce the concluding part of the aforesaid judgment, which is as under:-

“**14.** Through amending Act No.V of 2010, Section 32 has been amended with effect from 13th June, 2009. Sub-section (1) of section 32 provides that appointments on the posts of officers and staff in the Ehtesab Bureau shall be made in the prescribed manner and prescribed means “prescribed by rules made under this Act”. As has been observed above that the Rules framed by the President on 22nd June, 2009, have no legal force because at the said date, the President had no powers to frame the Rules. The amending Act has been given effect from 13th June,

2009. The legislature has power to apply an Act with retrospective effect and retrospective effect shall not affect any right accrued to a party. No Rules were framed by the Government between 18th June, 2010, when the Act was promulgated and 13th June, 2009 from the date the Act was given effect. It is manifest that no Rules were framed by the Government during this period and practically till to date no Rules have been framed by the Government. In the absence of any Rule, there is no mode for appointment in the light of provisions contained in section 32 of the Ehtesab Bureau Act, 2001.

15. Here we may observe that the Ehtesab Bureau is an important institution of the State. Under section 32 of the Act, 2001, all the appointments in the Ehtesab Bureau have to be made in a prescribed manner. Clause (qq) of section 4 of the Ehtesab Bureau Act, was added through amending Act No.V of 2010, which says that “prescribed means prescribed by rules made under this Act.” The amendment was introduced in the Act, 2010 with effect from 13th June, 2009. It is the duty of the Government to provide a mode for appointment of the officers and staff in the Ehtesab Bureau while framing the Rule. Non-framing of Rules is a serious violation of the Act and it creates hardships for the appointment of officers and staff in the Ehtesab Bureau. It is desirable that Government shall frame the Rules under section 32 of the Ehtesab Bureau Act, 2001, forthwith.

The result of the above discussion is that fining no force in these appeals, these are hereby dismissed with no order as to costs.”

Later on, Civil Appeal No.418/2019 titled as “Raja Muhammad Kabir Khan Vs. Chairman Ehtesab Bureau and others” was filed before the Apex Court of Azad Jammu & Kashmir. The Apex Court has observed as under:-

“5.We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record. The sole grievance of the appellant is that he is liable to pensionary benefits. It may be stated here that the appellant was appointed on contract basis. His services were

subsequently regularized in the light of Ehtesab Bureau Rules, 2009, *supra*, which were declared invalid and of no legal value by this Court in the case reported as “*Sardar Muhammad Razzaq Vs. Chairman Ehtesab Bureau and others*” [2015 SCR 1156]. Thus, all the acts done in pursuance of said Rules were illegal. As the appellant was not a permanent employee, hence, he has rightly been relieved of from the service without granting pensionary benefits. So far as the case of Maqbool Hussain, Driver, is concerned, we have examined the record and found that the pensionary benefits were sanctioned in his favour on 13.05.2015, when the judgment of this Court was not holding the field, hence, the argument of the learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant has been treated in a discriminatory manner has no substance. The impugned judgment passed by the High Court is well reasoned calling for no interference by this Court.

6. Before parting with, it may be noted here that the judgment of this Court was delivered in the year, 2015. After laps of considerable time, still the controversy has not been resolved. When the learned Chief Prosecutor was confronted in this regard, he submitted that the posts have been advertised in accordance with new rules, however, some of the employees challenged the advertisement before the High Court, whereupon, the stay order has been issued on the basis of leave granting order issued by the Court in this case. It appears that the proper assistance is not being rendered before the High Court. This case has nothing to with the advertisement and filling of the posts. As stated hereinabove, the Ehtesab Bureau Rules, 2009 were declared invalid by this Court, hence, thereafter the posts were liable to be advertised and filled in strictly in accordance with new Rules. In this regard, the directions were issued by this Court in a number of cases, but the appropriate steps have not been taken by the Ehtesab Bureau. In the public interest, we direct the Registrar, High Court to put up all the cases pertaining to the employees of the Ehtesab Bureau before the Court for decision of the same within a period of one month. In the meantime, if any case is fixed for hearing, that shall be immediately disposed of. The Registrar High Court

is also directed to submit compliance report through Registrar of this Court.

The appeal is dismissed with the above observations, with no order as to the costs.”

As adumbrated more grievances voiced by the petitioners is that they are claiming permanence against the posts held by them. The matter has already been dealt with by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in announcement mentioned above, particularly in a case titled as “Raja Muhammad Kabir Khan Vs. Chairman Ehtesab Bureau and others” certain direction and clear cut method has been given by the Apex Court for framing of rules and filling in all the slots of Ehtesab Bureau in accordance with law, therefore, a little bit deviation from direction of Hon’ble Supreme Court cannot be made. Even clear cut dicta of the Apex Court is liable to be followed and acted upon as per Article 42-B of the Azad Jammu & Kashmir Interim Constitution, 1974.

Article 42-B of the Azad Jammu & Kashmir Interim Constitution, 1974 corresponds to Article 189 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973 which postulates in an unambiguous manner that the decisions of the Supreme Court insofar as they decide any question of law or are based upon or enunciate a principle of law, shall be binding on all the Courts in Azad Jammu & Kashmir. It was held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of Pakistan in a case of

Justice Khurshid Anwar Bhinder Vs. Federation of Pakistan reported as [PLD 2010 SC 483] that even obiter dictum of the Supreme Court enjoys a highly respected position as if it contains a definite expression of the Court's view on a legal principle, or the meaning of law.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has not indicated the way out pertaining to the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court through which the grievance of the petitioners can be resolved but they have practically failed to point out any way out or mechanism in the light of which the prayed relief in the writ petitions can be extended in favour of the petitioners.

It is also pertinent to mention here that no permanent right as per law of the land can be claimed and asked for on the basis of temporary employment or employment which is not within the tent and compass of law. Meaning thereby that it is not outcome of proceedings sine-co-non for appointment in the eye of law, thus, no aid can be provided for permanence of services of the petitioners.

Thus, in the light of what has been stated above, the above titled writ petitions are hereby disposed of in the manner indicated as under:-

- (i) The respondents are directed to do the needful Quo, filling up of these available slots of Ehtesab Bureau in accordance with law through Public Service

Commission and Selection Board Committees expeditiously within a period of four months after receipt of the instant order;

- (ii) Till completion of selection process by the Public Service Commission and respective selection authority, the respondents are hereby directed to refrain from relieving the petitioners from the respective posts/jobs;
- (iii) The petitioners who have been removed/ousted from service are restored to their respective posts who shall hold the posts till recommendations of the respective selection authority;
- (iv) In Writ Petitions No. 2111/18 and 2125/18, the respondent (Ehtesab Bureau) is also directed to initiate the matter Qua repatriation of the petitioners to their parent department. The petitioners are also at liberty to compete against the posts they are holding in Ehtesab Bureau in accordance with law as well. The department concerned is hereby directed to adjust them in accordance with law.
- (v) The respondents are hereby directed to entertain the applications of those candidates who could not apply in the Public Service Commission and selection authority (by giving them further time of one month).

Muzaffarabad.
07.07.2022

-Sd- -Sd- -Sd-
CHIEF JUSTICE JUDGE JUDGE