

REGISTERED



GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

PENALTY ORDER

SO(Estt)1-71/2006. WHEREAS, Ms. Naila Yousaf, Senior Special Education Teacher (M.C. Field/BS-17), previously posted at Govt. Middle Special Education Centre for (04) Disabilities, Jaranwala, District Faisalabad, was initially granted Ex-Pakistan Extraordinary Leave without pay for 365 days w.e.f. 15.03.2024 to 14.03.2025 vide Department's order dated 08.03.2024. On her subsequent request for extension of Ex-Pakistan Extraordinary Leave, the Competent Authority sanctioned only 365 days' leave without pay w.e.f. 14.03.2025 to 13.03.2026 vide Department's order dated 24.03.2025, with an express direction to report back for duty upon expiry of the sanctioned leave. Thus, her sanctioned leave unequivocally expired on 13.03.2026 and she was required to resume duty w.e.f. 14.03.2026. Notwithstanding the aforesaid express direction, Ms. Naila Yousaf failed to resume duty and remained absent w.e.f. 14.03.2026 without prior permission or approval of leave by the Competent Authority.

2. **AND WHEREAS**, in view of the unimpeachable documentary evidence available on record establishing absence of the accused officer, it was considered unnecessary to hold a regular inquiry under Section 5(1)(b) of the Act, and accordingly, *while dispensing with regular inquiry*, proceedings were initiated under Section 7(b) read with Section 5(1)(a) of the Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Act, 2006 vide Show Cause Notice dated **17.06.2026** on the following charge of misconduct on account of absence from duty, namely:

"You have been found willfully absent from your duty w.e.f. 14.03.2026 to till date without prior permission / approval of leave by the Competent Authority."

3. **AND WHEREAS**, despite due service of Show Cause Notice, the accused officer failed to submit any written reply. Such deliberate silence amounts to forfeiture of the opportunity to rebut the allegations and leaves the documentary evidence un rebutted. However, in order to ensure complete adherence to the principles of natural justice and to afford every reasonable opportunity of defence, the accused officer was granted personal hearing. She did not appear on the first date fixed for hearing; instead, her father-in-law appeared on her behalf, submitted a written reply and sought adjournment. A further opportunity was thereafter granted vide notice dated 17.08.2026, whereby she was specifically informed that the case would be decided on the basis of the available record in case of failure to appear.

4. **AND WHEREAS**, subsequently, on her request for an online hearing, she was afforded a further opportunity of personal hearing through Zoom on 27.08.2026. She attended the said hearing and was heard at length. Her written reply, submissions made during the hearing and the record relating to her absence were duly considered during the hearing.

5. **AND WHEREAS**, in her defence, the accused officer principally pleaded that her absence was occasioned by serious medical circumstances concerning her minor daughter. She further stated that she had applied for extension of Ex-Pakistan Extraordinary Leave and had sent reminders to the Department, and that she remained under the impression that her request was under consideration. She accordingly sought condonation of her absence and sanction of further leave.

6. **AND WHEREAS**, the defence advanced by the accused officer has been carefully examined and considered but is not found sufficient to exonerate her from the charge. The undisputed position on record is that the leave actually sanctioned, expired on 13.03.2026. Thereafter, no extension of leave was sanctioned in her favour. An application for extension of leave, by itself, does not create any vested or deemed entitlement to remain absent from duty, nor can a pending request for leave be treated as approval by the Competent Authority. The accused officer was under a clear and binding obligation to resume duty upon expiry of the sanctioned leave unless and until any further leave was formally sanctioned.

7. **AND WHEREAS**, the plea that she remained under an impression that her request for extension was being processed cannot legally justify her continued absence. A civil servant is required to obtain lawful sanction of leave before remaining away from duty. In the present case, the accused officer neither resumed duty upon expiry of her sanctioned leave nor produced any order whereby the Competent Authority authorized her continued absence w.e.f. 14.03.2026. Her continued absence, therefore, remained unauthorized throughout the period in question.

8. **AND WHEREAS**, the medical circumstances pleaded by the accused officer have also been taken into consideration with due regard. However, even assuming such circumstances to be genuine and compelling, they do not retrospectively convert an unauthorized absence into sanctioned leave, particularly where the competent authority had not approved the requested extension. The existence of a personal or family difficulty cannot dispense with the requirement of obtaining lawful permission for absence from duty. The accused officer had the option of placing the circumstances before the Competent Authority and seeking appropriate leave, but could not unilaterally assume that the requested leave stood sanctioned.

9. **AND WHEREAS**, the conduct of the accused officer is further aggravated by the fact that her absence commenced immediately upon expiry of the sanctioned leave despite an express direction to report back for duty. The obligation to resume duty was neither ambiguous nor conditional. Her continued failure to report for duty, in the absence of any order authorizing extension of leave, demonstrates disregard of the lawful administrative direction and constitutes a serious breach of discipline expected of a civil servant.

10. **AND WHEREAS**, the record establishes that the accused officer remained absent from duty w.e.f. 14.03.2026 till date without prior permission/approval of leave by the Competent Authority. The documentary record, including the sanctioned leave orders, the direction to report back, the absence record and the accused officer's own defence, sufficiently establishes the factual foundation of the charge.

11. **NOW THEREFORE**, in exercise of the powers conferred under the Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Act, 2006, I, **Shoaib Iqbal Syed**, Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, Special Education Department/Competent Authority in this case, after having carefully examined the entire record and for the reason recorded hereinabove, found the charge proved, therefore, hereby imposes upon **Ms. Naila Yousaf**, Senior Special Education Teacher (M.C. Field/BS-17), Govt. Middle Special Education Centre for (04) Disabilities, Jaranwala, District Faisalabad, the major penalty of '**Removal from Service**' under Section 4(1)(b)(v) of the PEEDA Act, 2006, on account of her proved misconduct of unauthorized/willful absence from duty w.e.f. 14.03.2026 till date without prior permission or approval of leave by the Competent Authority.

12. This order shall take effect forthwith in accordance with law.

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

Dated Lahore, the
September 15 /2026

No. & Date Even:

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

1. The Accountant General Punjab, Lahore.
2. The Director General, Special Education Punjab, Lahore.
3. The District Education Officer (Special Education), Faisalabad.
4. Headmaster / Headmistress, Govt. Middle Special Education Centre for (04) Disabilities, Jaranwala, District Faisalabad.
5. PS to Secretary Special Education Department, Lahore.
6. Statistical Officer, Directorate General, Special Education Punjab, Lahore.
7. Accused officer / **Ms. Naila Yousaf**, Senior Special Education Teacher (M.C. Field/BS-17), Govt. Middle Special Education Centre for (04) Disabilities, Jaranwala, District Faisalabad.


SECTION OFFICER (ESTT-I)
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT