

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR**

**C.P No. D- 3449 of 2015**

Date of hearing: 05-10-2021

Date of Order: 05-10-2021

Mr. Hadi Bakhsh Bhatt, Advocate for petitioners.  
Mr. Asfandyar Kharal, Assistant Advocate General along with Abdul  
Majid Bullo, D.E.O (Primary) Sukkur.

.....

**ORDER.**

**Muhammad Junaid Ghaffar, J.** – Through this petition, the petitioners seek the following reliefs :-

- (a) To direct the respondent No. 2 to 5 issue offer and appointment orders of the petitioners as per policy and advertisement as well as Teachers Recruitment policy 2012 and merits, who have not only secured passing marks but also are eligible for the post of PSTs.
- (b) To grant any other alternate relief which this Honourable Court deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.
- (c) To award cost of this petition

Notice was ordered and comments have been filed by District Education Officer (Primary) Sukkur / Respondent No.5 and relevant paragraph Nos. 8 and 14 read as under :

(8) The contents of Para No. (8) it is submitted that the petitioner No.3 (Ms. Fozia D/O Bashir Ahmed produce the PRC form 'D' issued on 09.05.2014, after cut of date of advertisement so far petitioner No.3 did not consider for her appointment.

(14) The Honourable Court is pray to dismissed the petition on the grounds as under:-

That the Petitioner No.1 & 3 both were not considered for appointment being produce the important documents i.e PRC form 'D' after cut date of advertisement (Annexure 'A' and 'B'.

That the petitioner No.2 is not considered for her appointment for the post of PST because she had submitted Two Domicile certificates issued by the D.C Sukkur, vide No. 3459, dated 16.06.2008 (Annexure 'C') and after some time she again submitted a copy of another Domicile by changing the residential address (Annexure 'D'),

therefore, the matter was referred to D.C Sukkur regarding changing of residential address in Domicile certificate, the D.C Sukkur vide letter No.GB/4081/ dated 26.09.2014, (Annexure 'E') clarified that the petitioners has change her place of residence and the changing should be treated from the date of issuance of CNIC of the petitioners viz. 20.05.2014.

In view of above circumstances, the case of petitioner No.2 was also not considered by keeping in view change of place of residence after the cut date of advertisement.

We have heard learned counsel as well as learned Assistant Advocate General and perused the record.

From perusal of the record and the comments, it reflects that insofar as Petitioner Nos. 1 and 3 are concerned, they admittedly submitted domicile /PRC much after the cutoff date provided in the advertisement as well as the Recruitment policy and, therefore, they were not considered. Similarly, insofar as petitioner No.2 is concerned, she in fact furnished two separate Domicile Certificates issued by the Deputy Commissioner Sukkur, showing different residential addresses and, therefore, she was also not considered. It has been provided in the Teachers' Recruitment Policy 2012 that the District Recruitment Committee has to verify the original documents including CNIC, PRC and domicile and on the basis of such documents, the D.R.C has to determine that as to which Union Council the candidate belongs and only after such verification an applicant can be considered for appointment as all vacancies / posts are based on and dependent on Union Council requirements. All petitioners before us have failed to satisfy the said criteria and, therefore, no case is made out; hence, the petition being misconceived is hereby **dismissed**.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Irfan/PA