



ORDER

No. SO(ESTT.)43-25/2013. WHEREAS, disciplinary proceedings under Section 5 read with Sections 9 and 10 of the Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Act, 2006 (PEEDA Act, 2006) were initiated against Mr. Muhammad Latif, Assistant (BS-16), Government National Special Education Centre, Johar Town, Lahore and Mr. Muhammad Sadaqat, Upper Division Clerk (BS-14), Government National Special Education Centre, Johar Town, Lahore, vide Order of Inquiry dated 30.10.2025, subsequently substituted vide order dated 10.12.2025, on the following charges of inefficiency, misconduct and corruption by appointing Ms. Sobia Asif, Headmistress (BS-18), Government Special Education Centre, Nishtar Town, Lahore as Inquiry Officer;

- i. Mr. Muhammad Latif, Assistant, and Mr. Muhammad Sadaqat, UDC, while serving in the Government National Special Education Centre, Johar Town, Lahore, illegally demanded and received gratification of Rs. 20,000/- from the complainants, namely Mr. Sultan Shoukat and his mother, Mst. Kalsoom Bibi (widow of Shoukat Ali, late, Ex-Driver of the Centre), on the pretext of initiating the salary of the deceased and creation of OSD post in their favour.
- ii. Instead of initiating proceedings for the sanction of the OSD post under the financial assistance package of Government of Punjab, Mr. Muhammad Latif, Assistant, and Mr. Muhammad Sadaqat (UDC), willfully and dishonestly continued the salary of the deceased employee without lawful sanction. By doing so, they have violated prescribed rules and procedures, causing unlawful financial implications for the department.
- iii. Despite the lapse of considerable time, Mr. Muhammad Latif, Assistant, and Mr. Muhammad Sadaqat (UDC) both failed to prepare and submit the case for creation of OSD post to the competent authority. Due to their misconduct and intentional non-compliance, the widow of the deceased employee has been deprived of her family pension for more than five years (from 01.01.2020 till date), thereby causing undue hardship, financial loss, and mental agony to the complainants.

2. **AND WHEREAS**, the Inquiry Officer, after conducting thorough inquiry in accordance with the provisions of the PEEDA Act, 2006, after affording full opportunity of defence to the accused officer and official as well as to the complainants and the Departmental Representative, submitted the inquiry report wherein the evidence, documents, statements, cross-examinations and all relevant material available on record were comprehensively examined and analyzed charge-wise. The Inquiry Officer concluded that all the charges levelled against the accused officer/official through the order of inquiry remained unsubstantiated. Accordingly, the Inquiry Officer recommended that the accused officer/official be exonerated of the charges.

3. **AND WHEREAS**, regarding Charge No.1 relating to the alleged demand and receipt of illegal gratification amounting to Rs.20,000/-, the Inquiry Officer concluded that the allegation remained unsubstantiated. The complainants failed to produce any independent witness, documentary evidence or corroborative material in support of the allegation. The complaint was lodged after an inordinate delay of almost eight years from the alleged occurrence, thereby adversely affecting its credibility. The statements of the complainants were also found to be contradictory and inconsistent during cross-examination. Consequently, the allegation of corruption was held to be unproved.

4. **AND WHEREAS**, regarding Charge No.2 pertaining to the alleged willful continuation of salary of the deceased employee without lawful sanction and failure to initiate proceedings for creation of OSD post, the Inquiry Officer found that the record established that the case for creation of OSD post had in fact been prepared and handed over to the complainant, Mr. Sultan Shoukat, under proper acknowledgment for onward submission to the office concerned. The complainant himself admitted receipt and submission of the case. Therefore, no evidence surfaced establishing any deliberate omission, misconduct or inefficiency on the part of either accused officer / official.

5. **AND WHEREAS**, regarding Charge No.3 concerning alleged failure to process the case of OSD post and consequent delay in sanction of family pension, the Inquiry Officer concluded that the delay was attributable to deficiencies, discrepancies and complications in the documentation furnished by the complainants themselves, including issues relating to succession documents, family registration particulars and service record. The Inquiry Officer further observed that no material was available on record to establish intentional non-compliance, negligence or mala fide on the part of the accused officer or accused official.

6. **AND WHEREAS**, upon thorough examination of the inquiry report, along with the entire case record, including the findings and recommendations of the Inquiry Officer, it is evident that the Inquiry Officer adopted a comprehensive and methodical approach to ascertain the veracity of the charges. All relevant documentary evidence was meticulously scrutinized, and statements of all concerned individuals were duly recorded during the inquiry proceedings. Despite the exhaustive inquiry process, no incriminating material or substantive evidence was found to establish the involvement of the accused officer/official in the commission of the alleged acts. The findings of the Inquiry Officer unequivocally conclude that all charges levelled against the accused officer/official remained unproven and unsubstantiated. Moreover, the record reflects that the Inquiry Officer conducted the proceedings strictly in accordance with the applicable statutory provisions of the PEEDA Act, 2006, while adhering to the principles of natural justice and due process. A detailed appraisal of the recommendations contained in the inquiry report confirms that they are grounded in fact, supported by the available documentary evidence, and are consistent with the findings recorded during the inquiry.

7. **NOW THEREFORE, I, Shoaib Iqbal Syed**, Secretary Special Education / Competent Authority in the instant case, for the reasons stated hereinabove and in exercise of powers conferred upon me under Section 13(5) of the Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Act, 2006, while concurring with the findings and recommendations of the Inquiry Officer, do hereby **exonerate** Mr. Muhammad Latif, Assistant (BS-16), Government National Special Education Centre, Johar Town, Lahore and Mr. Muhammad Sadaqat, UDC (BS-14), Government National Special Education Centre, Johar Town, Lahore, under Section 13(3) of the Act *ibid*, from the charges levelled against them vide order of inquiry dated 30.10.2025, subsequently substituted vide order dated 10.12.2025.

(SHOAIB IQBAL SYED)
SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT /
COMPETENT AUTHORITY

Dated Lahore, the
July 07 /2026

No. & Date Even:

A copy is forwarded for information and necessary action to the:-

1. The Director General, Special Education Punjab, Lahore.
2. District Education Officer (Special Education), Lahore.
3. **Accused Officer** / Muhammad Latif. Assistant, Govt. National Special Education Centre, Johar Town.
4. **Accused Official** / Mr. Muhammad Sadaqat, UDC, Govt. National Special Education Centre, Johar Town, Lahore.
5. PS to Secretary Special Education Department.

SECTION OFFICER (ESTT.-I)
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT