ORDER SHEET

BEFORE THE SINDH SUBORDINATE JUDICIARY SERVICE TRIBUNAL (HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI)

Service Appeal 01 of 2026

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF CHAIRMAN/MEMBER(S)

1. For orders on office objection a/w reply as at 'A'.
2. For orders on CMA No.1091/2026.
3. For hearing of main case.

16.11.2026

Appellant Zulfiqar Ali Giancho, is present in person.

Briefly sated appellant was appointed Junior Clerk in 2005 in the office of District Judge, Qamber Shahdadkot. Vide order dated 03.12.2005. He was transferred to district Karachi-Central on his own request and upon terms that he would be at the bottom of seniority list in his respective grade in the transferee district. This order has not been challenged/assailed by the appellant. Once again, and ostensively upon his request terms similar to the previous, he was transferred from district Karachi-Central to district Qamber Shahdadkot vide order dated 01.11.2025. Per the pleadings the said order has not been impugned. The memorandum of appeal and the prayer clause thereof impugnes order dated 10.12.2025, whereby his representation for restoration of seniority in district Qamber Shahdadkot was declined by the Chief Justice. Contrary to the pleadings, the appellant appearing in person states that he has in fact impugned order dated 01.11.2025 notwithstanding/contrary to what is stated in the pleadings.

The respective transfers were conditional upon acceptance of placement at the bottom of seniority list. Nothing is demonstrated before us to suggest that same were ever declined by the appellant. The order pleaded to have been impugned declines the claim for seniority on the basis that the placement by transfer was consciously at the bottom of the list therefore no case is made out to displace the same, subsequently, once relevant transfer had already been attained. Nothing has been articulated before us controverting the rationale and/or that the conclusion could not be rested thereupon.

Be that as it may, the appellant has taken a stance contrary to the pleadings by insisting that order impugned is that 01.11.2025. It is considered relevant to denote that there is office objection that the appeal

is time barred even in respect of latter order pleaded to have been assailed. The said objection becomes more pronounced when an earlier order is sought to be impeached. No rationale has been articulated to justify the delay and no application under section 5 of the Limitation Act has been preferred. Therefore, the present appeal is dismissed on account being time barred.

Chairman

Member

Khuhro/PS