

ORDER

No. SO(Estt)2-32/2008. WHEREAS, visit of Govt. Secondary School of Special Education for Hearing Impaired (Boys), Multan was conducted on 03.06.2023 and it was observed that **Ms. Adeeba Naz**, Instructor Physical Education (BS-18/Personal), ex-Incharge Principal, Govt. Secondary School of Special Education for Hearing Impaired (Boys), Multan ('accused officer') failed to perform her duties in befitting manner and consequent thereupon, due to her inefficiency administrative matters of Govt. Secondary School of Special Education for Hearing Impaired (Boys), Multan were not properly handled. Accordingly, disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the accused officer vide Show Cause Notice dated 21.09.2023 under Section 7(b) read with Section 5(1)(a) of the Act *ibid* on the following charge of misconduct and inefficiency:

- i. At present, 226 special students are enrolled in the school out of which only 40-50 students were present on the day of visit.
- ii. There were six buses out of which only four buses were roadworthy, however, on the day of visit pick & drop facility was suspended on the pretext that budget under Head of P.O.L was not available but District Education Officer (Spl. Edu.), Multan rebutted the statement reporting that the current situation was the result of your negligence and lack of interest as more than one million rupees was lapsed in the Financial Year 2022-2023.
- iii. District Education Officer (Spl. Edu.) Multan reported that Rs. 02.000 million had been provided to this school to get repair two off-road school buses but you did not initiate any process to get the vehicles repaired.
- iv. Syeda Saliha Hussain, Speech Therapist was absent from duty on the day of visit without prior approval / permission but you did not report her absence.
- v. Safety of the special students is your foremost responsibility being head of the institute but you failed to notice and point out that out of 32 CCTV cameras installed in the school only 11 cameras were functional which demonstrates your poor monitoring.
- vi. During visit of the classes, it was noted that students were in dirty and different uniforms.
- vii. During the visit, you misstated that syllabus has not yet been provided by the Academic wing of DGSE but Director Academics clarified that syllabus for vocational courses was available and provided in 2022.
- viii. Water dispenser was placed in store without any justification.
- ix. Audiology Clinic was in a very bad and dirty condition which depicts that cleanliness was not made since long.
- x. Hostel block having eight rooms was not functional and closed.

- xi. At the outside of the building, water tank was running and taps were leaking which may become a causal agent of dengue larva. Whereas, you submitted report about the zero-dengue larva and observance of SOPs which prima facie shows misstatement and false reporting on your part.
- xii. Principal residence was occupied by an outsider after seeking stay orders from the Court but you failed to report such case to the higher authorities.
- xiii. Doors of the classrooms and student furniture was in shabby and broken condition and you never took any measure to get it repaired.
- xiv. Uniform was provided in 2021 and stipend was disbursed in March 2021 afterwards nothing was provided to the students.
- xv. You failed to produce assessment files of special students conducted by Health Department during health screening despite repeated instructions of DGSE.
- xvi. No map of the school was available which may reflect scheme for distribution of classrooms. No directional boards were fixed on any prominent place for public awareness despite repeated directions by the Department.

2. **AND WHEREAS**, the aforementioned Show Cause Notice instructed the accused officer to provide her written reply within seven days. As a result, she submitted a written reply which was reviewed and found to be unsatisfactory. Hence, in order to conclude the disciplinary proceedings, vide letter dated 24.10.2023, **Deputy Secretary**, Special Education was appointed Hearing Officer, *under Section 7 (d) of the Act ibid*, to provide the accused officer with a chance of a personal hearing and the accused officer was summoned to appear before the Hearing Officer on 01.11.2023 for hearing proceeding.

3. **AND WHEREAS**, the Hearing Officer after affording opportunities of personal hearing to the accused officer on 01.11.2023, 15.11.2023, 12.12.2023 and 20.12.2023, submitted report of hearing proceedings stating therein that during the course of hearing, the accused officer reiterated the stance she had previously made in her written reply and requested that she may be exonerated from the charges. The former District Education (Spl. Edu.), Multan and presently posted District Education Officer (Spl. Edu.), Multan, in contrast, presented all the relevant documentation for the case and asserted that charges levelled against the accused officer are established by the record, making the accused officer accountable for delinquent acts.

4. **AND WHEREAS**, after hearing the accused officer and all concerned, reviewing the accused officer's response, the pertinent documents in the file, as well as the evidence provided by the accused officer, the Hearing Officer observed that despite providing ample opportunities to the accused officer to vindicate her stance and to prove her innocence, she failed to place on record any new evidence to rebut the charges levelled against her and to prove her innocence. The Hearing Officer further observed that all the charges of inefficiency and misconduct levelled against the accused officer through Show Cause Notice stood proved. The Hearing Officer further observed that as per record the omissions and acts of inefficiency attributed

to the accused officer do not stem from malicious intent. Furthermore, reports from both the current and former District Education Officers indicate that significant steps have been undertaken to address and rectify the identified shortcomings.

5. **AND WHEREAS**, examination of written response submitted by the accused officer and findings of the Hearing Officer, along with the record that is available on file, it is observed with regards to charge No. 1 that out of a total enrollment of 226 special students, only 40-50 students were present during the visit. The accused officer contends that the absence of fuel, attributed to the discontinuation of funds, resulted in the discontinuation of pick and drop by the school buses, resulting in the diminished student attendance. However, upon examination of record, it is evident that there is no documentary evidence demonstrating proactive measures undertaken by the accused officer to maximize student attendance or rectify the bus operational issues. Consequently, the explanation offered by the accused officer fails to satisfactorily address the circumstances, thereby indicating a lack of efficiency on her part. With regards to charge No.2, it is noticed that the position asserted by the accused officer in response to this allegation is contradicted by the statement of former District Education Officer (Special Education, Multan). Moreover, there is a lack of documentary evidence indicating any concerted efforts on the part of the accused officer to address the issues concerning the provision of fuel and to restore the operational status of the school buses. Such conduct on the part of the accused officer constitutes negligence and demonstrates a lack of commitment towards the effective management of the school's affairs. With regards to charge No. 3, it is observed that the accused officer has asserted that she initiated the repair process for two non-operational school buses; however, the completion of the process was hindered by the lack of acceptance of the tender by any party. When questioned by the Hearing Officer during course of hearing proceedings about the ability of other schools within the district to successfully repair their non-operational buses, the accused officer cited contractor participation in their tender processes. This response suggests a lack of dedicated effort on the part of the accused officer to diligently pursue the repair of the non-operational buses. Consequently, the charge of inefficiency is substantiated.

6. **AND WHEREAS**, with regards to charge No. 4, it is observed that the accused officer contends that Syeda Saliha Hussain was not absent but rather on casual leave. However, when questioned during the course of personal hearing by the Hearing Officer regarding the submission of approved leave documentation to the appropriate authority and presented with the attendance register indicating the marking of Syeda Saliha Hussain's casual leave, the accused officer failed to provide a satisfactory response. With regards to charge No. 5, it is observed that the explanation provided by the accused officer in response to this charge appears to be merely a narrative constructed to cover the deficiencies. Furthermore, it was observed that 21 cameras within the school were non-functional, indicating inadequate monitoring on the part of the accused officer. The assertion made by the accused officer regarding the non-functionality of the cameras due to high voltage stroke or fluctuation lacks substantiating documentary evidence. When queried during course of personal hearing by the Hearing Officer about whether she reported any such incident to higher authorities to facilitate appropriate action for the security and safety of the special needs children, the accused officer failed to offer a credible

justification. With regards to charge No. 6, it is observed that the response provided by the accused officer indicates her awareness of the primary responsibility to ensure the provision of uniforms to special students. However, she attributed the failure to distribute uniforms over the past two years to financial constraints, non-allocation of budget by the Chief Executive Officer (District Education Authority), Multan, and centralized procurement procedures. Notably, neither the current nor the former District Education Officer has refuted this fact, thus indicating a lack of evidence to substantiate this charge.


7. **AND WHEREAS**, with regards to charge No. 7, it is observed that the response provided by the accused officer is deemed adequate to substantiate the charge, rendering further discussion unnecessary. With regards to charge No. 8, it is observed that the accused officer's explanation regarding the placement of the water dispenser in storage is deemed unjustified, thereby indicating a failure on her part as supervisory officer to fulfill her duties in a manner befitting her role. With regards to charge No. 9, it is observed that the accused officer's justification that the audiology clinic was repurposed due to the absence of an appointed or posted audiologist cannot be regarded as a valid reason to excuse the substandard cleanliness conditions of the premises. With regards to charge No. 10, it is observed that the accused officer indeed acknowledges the factual basis of the charge, thus affirming its validity and substantiation. It is further observed that the accused officer preferred to keep the premises closed rather to utilize the same for other useful purpose.

8. **AND WHEREAS**, with regards to charge No. 11, it is observed that the accused officer does not contest the truthfulness of this charge. Instead, she asserts that anti-mosquito spray is sprinkled at personal expense. However, she acknowledges the possibility of occasional non-permanent water accumulation around the water cooler due to student usage. Regular inspections conducted by health department teams have consistently reported zero instances of dengue larvae within the school premises. Additionally, a designated day teacher has been assigned the responsibility of maintaining vigilance and promptly reporting any concerns for timely resolution. The response provided by the accused officer indicates acknowledgment of the issue regarding tap leakages, despite the absence of reported dengue cases. However, it is noted that reports concerning dengue larvae and water accumulation have consistently been forwarded to the Directorate General of Special Education (DGSE) by the accused officer as "Nil," indicating no instances of concern in this regard. With regards to charge No. 12, it is observed that the case pertaining to vacation of Principal residence from the illegal occupation of family of an ex-employee is currently pending before a Court of Competent jurisdiction, and the District Education Officer (DEO) has been instructed time to time to actively pursue the matter. Consequently, this charge cannot be considered substantiated at this time. With regards to charge No. 13, it is observed that the response provided by the accused officer in addressing this charge is deemed unsatisfactory. It appears evident that minimal effort has been exerted by the accused officer to facilitate the repair of broken doors and furniture. Therefore, this charge stands substantiated.

9. **AND WHEREAS**, with regards to charge No. 14, it is observed that the justification provided by the accused officer, citing the unavailability of funds as the reason for the inability to distribute uniforms and pay stipends, aligns with the

records. Consequently, this charge cannot be considered substantiated. With regards to charge No. 15, it is observed that admittedly, the accused officer failed to produce assessment files during the course of visit. The stance that no record was asked to be produced is incorrect. Hence, this charge is proved. With regards to charge No. 16, it is observed that according to the records, neither map of the school illustrating the layout of classrooms was available, nor were directional boards affixed for public awareness. Therefore, this charge is deemed substantiated. It is also observed that record fully corroborates that the accused officer being supervisory officer failed to discharge her duties in a befitting manner.

**10. NOW THEREFORE, I, Saima Saeed, Secretary Special Education / Competent Authority** in the instant case, after having considered all the aspects and material relating to the case, *for reasons recorded herein above*, am of the view that the accused officer remained inefficient in discharge of her official duties and the charges stood proved, therefore, in exercise of powers vested upon me under Section 7(f) read with Section 4 of the Act *ibid* do hereby impose minor penalty of “Censure” in terms of Section 4(1)(a)(i) upon the accused officer.

  
(SAIMA SAEED)  
SECRETARY to

GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB  
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT /  
COMPETENT AUTHORITY

Dated Lahore, the  
February 29 /2024

**No. & Date Even:**

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

1. Accountant General, Punjab, Lahore.
2. Director General Special Education, Punjab, Lahore.
3. District Education Officer (Special Education) Multan.
4. Accused Officer concerned / **Ms. Adeeba Naz**, Instructor Physical Education (BS-18/Personal), Govt. Secondary School of Special Education for Hearing Impaired (Boys), Multan.
5. PS to Secretary Special Education Department.
6. Master file.

  
SECTION OFFICER (ESTT.)  
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT