

REGISTERED



GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

ORDER

No. LO(Appeal)11-2/2026. WHEREAS, Mr. Muhammad Mujahid, Ex-Junior Clerk (BS-11), filed a departmental appeal under Section 16 of the Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Act, 2006 (PEEDA Act, 2006) against the order dated 12.01.2026 passed by the Director General, Special Education Punjab / Competent Authority, whereby the major penalty of **Removal from Service** under Section 4(1)(b)(v) of the PEEDA Act, 2006 was imposed upon him on account of willful and unauthorized absence from duty.

2. **AND WHEREAS**, the record reveals that the appellant had earlier remained absent from duty from 10.09.2024 to 13.02.2025 (157 days) without sanctioned leave. Despite the said misconduct, a lenient view was adopted by the Competent Authority and only a minor penalty was imposed. Furthermore, the appellant was afforded a rehabilitative opportunity by placing him under observation in the Monitoring Wing to assess his future conduct, punctuality, attendance, and commitment towards official duties. However, instead of improving his conduct, the appellant again absented himself from duty continuously with effect from 01.05.2025 without obtaining prior permission or sanctioned leave from the Competent Authority. Consequently, disciplinary proceedings under Section 7(b) of the PEEDA Act, 2006 were initiated against him. A Show Cause Notice was issued and served upon him, requiring him to explain his conduct. The appellant neither submitted any satisfactory written defence nor produced any evidence to justify his unauthorized absence.

3. **AND WHEREAS**, the record further establishes that in order to ensure compliance with the principles of natural justice and fair play, the appellant was afforded repeated opportunities of personal hearing during the disciplinary proceedings. Despite service of notices at his recorded residential address, he deliberately failed to appear before the Competent Authority and chose not to avail the opportunities extended to him.

4. **AND WHEREAS**, the departmental appeal was examined in detail along with the comments of the Directorate General, Special Education Punjab, the impugned order, relevant record, grounds raised by the appellant, and all ancillary documents available on file. In order to afford the appellant an opportunity of personal hearing at the appellate stage as well, the appeal was fixed for hearing on **03.06.2026** and thereafter on **18.06.2026**. Hearing notices were issued and served upon the appellant. However, despite service of notices and availability of sufficient opportunity, the appellant failed to appear on either

date and did not furnish any justification for his non-appearance. His conduct reflects complete disinterest in pursuing his own appeal and demonstrates a continued disregard for lawful proceedings.

5. **AND WHEREAS**, I have carefully considered the grounds raised in the appeal. The contention that no opportunity of defence or personal hearing was afforded is belied by the record. The appellant was served with the Show Cause Notice and was repeatedly afforded opportunities of hearing during the disciplinary proceedings. The plea that disciplinary proceedings were conducted in violation of Article 10-A of the Constitution is equally misconceived because the requirement of due process stands fully satisfied when adequate opportunities are provided and the delinquent employee voluntarily chooses not to avail them. The law does not require the department to indefinitely await participation of an employee who persistently avoids disciplinary proceedings. Likewise, the plea regarding non-service of notices is without substance. The record demonstrates that notices were dispatched and served at the address available in the official record. The appellant has failed to produce any material showing that the departmental record contained a different address or that service was intentionally effected at an incorrect address.

6. **AND WHEREAS**, the contention that regular inquiry was mandatory in the circumstances of the case is also devoid of merit. The charge against the appellant pertained to unauthorized absence from duty, which stood established through documentary evidence including attendance record, absence reports, and official correspondence. The misconduct was therefore capable of determination on the basis of documentary evidence available on record, and the proceedings conducted under Section 7(b) of the PEEDA Act, 2006 cannot be termed unlawful.

7. **AND WHEREAS**, it is also noteworthy that the appellant is a habitual absentee. Even after being extended leniency and afforded an opportunity to reform his conduct following earlier disciplinary proceedings, he again absented himself from duty for a prolonged period without any lawful justification. Such conduct demonstrates persistent indiscipline, negligence, lack of devotion to duty, and complete disregard for official responsibilities. Government service requires discipline, accountability, and regular attendance. An employee who repeatedly remains absent without authorization and continuously ignores lawful directions cannot be permitted to undermine departmental discipline.

8. **AND WHEREAS**, the impugned order reflects due application of mind and contains cogent reasons supported by the record. No procedural illegality, jurisdictional defect, violation of law, misreading of evidence, or denial of due process has been identified which may warrant interference by the

Appellate Authority. The findings recorded by the Competent Authority are fully supported by the material available on record and do not suffer from any legal infirmity.

9. **NOW THEREFORE**, in view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, and after independent appraisal of the entire record, I am satisfied that the appellant has failed to make out any case for interference in the impugned order dated 12.01.2026. The appeal is devoid of merit and is accordingly **rejected**. Consequently, the penalty of **Removal from Service** imposed upon Mr. Muhammad Mujahid, Ex-Junior Clerk (BS-11), vide order dated 12.01.2026 is hereby upheld and maintained.

Dated Lahore the
June 29 / 2026

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

No. & Date Even.

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

1. Director General, Special Education, Punjab, Lahore.
2. District Accounts Officer, Gujranwala.
3. District Education Officer (Spl.Edu.) Gujranwala.
4. Headmaster, Government Special Education Centre, Kamoki, District Gujranwala.
5. Appellant concerned / **Mr. Muhammad Mujahid**, Junior Clerk (BS-11), currently at the disposal of this Directorate General. Resident of House No. 301, Mohalla Rehman Pura, Tanki wala chowk, Ichra Lahore. AND House No. 8, Street No. 5, Mohalla Ram Nagar, Dev Samaj Road, Lahore **0306-1408566**
6. PS to Secretary Special Education Department.


SECTION OFFICER (ESTT.-I)