

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

C.P NO. D-2606 of 2018
[Anwar Khan & Others v. Zarai Taraqiati Bank & Others]

Present:
Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon
Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar,

Dated: 20.11.2025

For hearing on MA-1056/2023

Mr. Aayatullah Khuwaja, Advocate for petitioners.
Mr. Ishrat Ali Lohar, Advocate Respondent No. 1, 2 & 3 along-with
Zulfiqar Ali Korai.
Mr. Mumtaz Alam Leghari, Advocate for Respondent No. 4
Mr. Muhammad Ismail Bhutto, Additional Advocate General, Sindh.
Mr. Maqbool Ahmed Sukhera, Head Legal ZTBL.

==

ORDER

RIAZAT ALI SAHAR, J:- The main petition was disposed of vide order dated 18.08.2022, with the relevant extract reproduced below:

“7. Since the issue involved in this petition is akin to the one decided by this Court in C.P. No. D-1218 of 2013 vide order dated 05.12.2017, which was upheld by the Hon’ble Supreme Court vide order dated 08.03.2019 in Civil Petition No. 312 of 2018, this petition is accordingly disposed of in terms of the ratio laid down in the order dated 08.03.2019 passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court.”

Thereafter, the petitioners filed Contempt Application No. MA-1056 of 2023 alleging non-compliance by the respondent Bank on the ground that they were not taken back into service at ZTBL. Consequently, contempt proceedings were initiated and a Show-Cause Notice dated 21.10.2025 was issued. In response, the respondents, President ZTBL and Zonal Chief (RBH) ZTBL Hyderabad, submitted that the petitioners had concealed material facts and misled this Court. They asserted that full compliance had been made by issuing appointment letters to all thirteen petitioners on 29.05.2023, inducting them permanently strictly in accordance with this Court’s order and the principles laid down in the cases of *Saleh Muhammad and Abdul Ghani*. They further stated that none of the petitioners joined ZTBL despite the appointment letters, nor raised any grievance, whereas 127 similarly placed individuals had already joined without objection. The petitioners continued serving at KSSL and receiving salaries therefrom. To avoid ambiguity, an Office Memorandum dated 17.11.2025 was also issued, again requesting the petitioners to join duties and asking KSSL to relieve them and provide their service record.

Respondent No. 4, MD Kissan Support Services Limited (KSSL), contended that KSSL is an independent entity regulated by SECP, with its own Board and regulations, and bears no administrative control over ZTBL concerning the induction or regularization of their services. It was submitted that when ZTBL issued

appointment letters, petitioners were relieved; however, upon their refusal to join ZTBL, KSSL continued to pay them in good faith. KSSL expressed no objection to relieving them again, subject to the clearance of the employer-contribution dues.

Upon examination of the record, it is evident that the respondents have complied with the directions contained in the order dated 18.08.2022 by issuing appointment letters on 29.05.2023 and subsequently reminding the petitioners through the Office Memorandum dated 17.11.2025 to furnish the requisite documents and join duties. Conversely, the petitioners have neither submitted their documents nor joined service despite repeated opportunities. However, at this stage, the counsel for the petitioners submitted that they shall be allowed to issue appointment orders in terms of the decision of the Supreme Court, and from 29.05.2023. Be that as it may, since the petitioners are entitled to relief in accordance with the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, as finally applied by this Court through its order dated 18.08.2022, they shall accordingly be extended the benefit from the date of this Court's order, in line with the principles laid down in the PSO case reported as **2018 SCMR 1181**.

For abundant clarity, it is further held that the appointment/regularization of the petitioners' services shall take effect from the date of the orders passed by this Court, and the service benefits for the intervening period shall be duly credited to their accounts, subject to verification under law. The respondents shall also ensure that the petitioners are allowed to join their duties without further delay.

With these observations, the contempt application stands disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE

JUDGE