



ORDER

No. SO(Estt)23-100/2016. WHEREAS, a complaint was lodged by Mr. Waqar Ahmed, Junior Special Education Teacher (BS-16 / MC Field), Wazirabad, District Gujranwala ('complainant') against Ms. Sana Ali, Junior Special Education Teacher (BS-16 / PH Field), Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala whereby the complainant alleged that Ms. Sana Ali, is doing M. Phil from Punjab University in day timing from 02:00 PM to 04:00 PM and attending total 04 classes in a week and 16 classes in a month. The complainant further alleged that Ms. Sana Ali has completed 1st semester and now it is the start of second semester. The complainant further alleged that she has not obtained NOC or Departmental Permission from the Competent Authority for said purpose. Furthermore, she daily avails short leave and attend University of the Punjab at 10:00 a.m. Moreover, former Headmaster of Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad, named Mr. Nasir Mehmood (BS-17+10% Special Pay / PH Field) presently posted at Govt. Special Education Centre, Aroop Town, Gujranwala was also involved in this matter and he always accommodated her. Upon receipt of complaint, vide letter dated 22.12.2023, Director General, Directorate General of Special Education, Punjab, Lahore was asked to probe the matter and submit a detailed report based on factual position. Accordingly, Deputy Director (Admn.), Directorate General of Special Education, Punjab, Lahore, vide letter dated 31.01.2024, forwarded a detailed report.

2. AND WHEREAS, upon receipt of above report and keeping in view sufficient grounds to proceed against the Ms. Sana Ali, Junior Special Education Teacher (BS-16 / PH Field), Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala ('accused officer No.1'), and Mr. Nasir Mehmood, Headmaster (BS-17+10% Special Pay / PH Field), previously posted at Special Education Centre, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala presently posted at Govt. Special Education Centre, Aroop Town, Gujranwala ('accused officer No. 2') (jointly referred as 'accused officers'), joint disciplinary proceedings through a regular inquiry under the PEEDA Act, 2006 were initiated against the accused officers on the following charges of misconduct and inefficiency by appointing Mr. Abdul Sattar, Headmaster (BS-18), Govt. Deaf and Defective Hearing School for Boys, Gulberg-II, Lahore as Inquiry Officer;

CHARGES AGAINST MS. SANA ALI, JSET

- i. The schedule of classes (Time Table) for M.Phil. Special Education (Session 2022-2024) issued by Institute of Special Education, University of the Punjab, Lahore submitted by Ms. Sana Ali is different from the one which has been submitted by the complainant / Mr. Waqar Ahmad. In the schedule of classes submitted by the complainant / Mr. Waqar Ali, the time for start of class is 02:00 P.M.

(four days a week / from Monday to Thursday) whereas, as per schedule of classes submitted by Ms. Sana Ali time for start of class is 03:00 P.M. (four days a week / from Monday to Thursday), this difference of time table shows that the accused officer has not submitted true time table which tantamounts to inefficiency and misconduct.

- ii. The accused officer daily avail short leave, without mentioning the same in attendance register, to attend her academic commitments and thereby compromise her duties as a Junior Special Education Teacher at the Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad which constitutes grave misconduct.

CHARGE AGAINST MR. NASIR MEHMOOD, HEADMASTER

Mr. Nasir Mehmood, in his capacity as the ex-Headmaster, Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad issued NOC to Ms. Sana Ali, JSET without permission / approval of the Competent Authority and also accommodated her in academic activities during regular working hours of the Centre by daily allowing her short leave without mentioning the same in attendance register which tantamounts to inefficiency and gross misconduct.

3. **AND WHEREAS**, the Inquiry Officer after conducting thorough inquiry into the charges submitted inquiry report, wherein the Inquiry Officer recommended imposition of following penalties upon the accused officers:

| Sr. No. | Name of accused officer | Penalty Proposed |
|---------|---|---|
| 1. | Ms. Sana Ali, Junior Special Education Centre, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala. | Minor penalty of "Censure" under section 4(1)(a)(i) of the PEEDA Act, 2006. |
| 2. | Mr. Nasir Mehmood, Headmaster (BS-17+10%), Govt. Special Education Centre, Aroop Town, Gujranwala | Minor penalty of "Censure" under section 4(1)(a)(i) of the PEEDA Act, 2006. |

4. **AND WHEREAS**, upon receipt of inquiry report, Show Cause-cum-Personal Hearing Notice under Section 13(4) of Act *ibid* was issued to the accused officers directing them to submit additional defence, *if any*, and also to appear before the Deputy Secretary, Special Education / **Hearing Officer** appointed under Section 13(4)(c) of the Act *ibid*, for personal hearing. The Departmental Representative was also directed to appear before the undersigned along with all record under Section 13(4)(e) of the Act *ibid*.

5. **AND WHEREAS**, the Hearing Officer after granting opportunity of personal hearing to the accused officers in presence of Departmental Representative submitted report of hearing proceedings stating therein that during the hearing proceedings, accused officers filed additional defence replies. During hearing proceedings, the accused officers while reiterating the stance taken by them during

the inquiry proceedings and in the additional defence replies filed by them, requested that the charge(s) are baseless and devoid of merit, therefore, they may be exonerated from the charge. On the other hand, the Departmental Representative stated that all record related to the charge(s) was provided to the accused officers and inquiry proceedings were conducted by the Inquiry Officer in accordance with the provisions of PEEDA, Act, 2006 and statements of all concerned were recorded and right of cross examination was also granted to the accused officers. The Departmental Representative further stated that charge(s) of inefficiency and misconduct stood proved against the accused officers. He further stated that the entire stance of the accused officers has been taken into consideration by the Inquiry Officer, hence penalty proposed to be imposed by the Inquiry Officer duly commensurates with the guilt of accused officers. The Hearing Officer was of the view that charge(s) stand proved and penalty proposed by the Inquiry Officer commensurates with the gravity of the proven charge(s) levelled against the accused officers.

6. **AND WHEREAS**, after a thorough examination and consideration of the case-related documentation, the findings and recommendations put forth by the designated Inquiry Officer, the additional defence replies presented by the accused officers and the report of the Hearing Officer, in conjunction with the comprehensive record available in the case file, it is evident that the charges levelled against accused officers have been thoroughly substantiated during the inquiry proceedings conducted in accordance with the Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline, and Accountability Act, 2006. The Inquiry Officer meticulously examined the facts, evidence, and statements provided by all concerned parties, ensuring procedural fairness and granting the accused officers full opportunity to defend themselves. Despite these safeguards, the responses submitted by the accused officers fail to exonerate them or provide a convincing rebuttal to the established charges.

7. **AND WHEREAS**, with regards to the charges levelled against accused officer No. 1, it is observed that accused officer No. 1 presented a class schedule indicating that her M.Phil. classes commenced at 3:00 PM. This contradicts the schedule submitted by the complainant, which shows the classes beginning at 2:00 PM. Upon analysis, the evidence reveals that accused officer No. 1 failed to provide corroborating documentation to support her claim of an amended timetable. Her reliance on a purported revision by the university lacks any official notification or credible proof. During inquiry proceedings, it was established that the complainant's version aligns with documented accounts of her activities during working hours, thereby demonstrating her attempt to mislead the inquiry by submitting an incorrect timetable. Such conduct undermines the integrity expected of a public servant and constitutes misconduct. It has been proven that accused officer No.1 availed short leaves on a regular basis to attend her academic classes without proper authorization or recording the same in the attendance register. The defense that these leaves were for official purposes (e.g., Directorate meetings or preparing examination papers) was unsupported by verifiable evidence. Moreover, the assertion that she availed leaves due to health issues was not substantiated by any official medical certificates or appropriate documentation. This lack of transparency

and proper procedure highlights inefficiency and misconduct, as it compromised her ability to fulfil her primary duties as a teacher entrusted with the education of children with special needs. Accused officer No. 1 claim that she did not neglect her duties or take unauthorized short leaves is directly contradicted by the evidence in the inquiry report, including testimony from colleagues and documented records. Her submission of a schedule with incorrect timings further erodes her credibility and reflects her deliberate intent to mislead the inquiry.

8. **AND WHEREAS**, with regards to the charge levelled against accused officer No. 2, during inquiry proceedings, it has been established that accused officer No. 2, in his capacity as Headmaster, issued an NOC to accused officer No. 1 without obtaining approval from the Competent Authority, in clear violation of procedural rules. His reliance on departmental guidelines regarding attendance in classes outside office hours is misplaced, as these guidelines specifically require that employees inform and seek permission from the Head of their Department. By bypassing the required approval process, accused officer No. 2 exhibited inefficiency and misconduct, as such unilateral actions compromise administrative discipline and set a dangerous precedent. The evidence demonstrates that accused officer No. 2 routinely permitted accused officer No. 1 to take short leaves during working hours to attend academic classes, without proper documentation or adherence to attendance protocols. His justification that these leaves were for health reasons or official tasks lacks corroboration and contradicts the evidence gathered during the inquiry proceedings. The contention of the accused officer No. 2 that the issuance of the NOC was permissible under departmental guidelines is factually incorrect, as those guidelines do not exempt the Headmaster from seeking approval from the Competent Authority. Furthermore, his claim that short leaves were granted for health or official reasons is contradicted by the inquiry findings, which clearly establish that the leaves were primarily for academic purposes during working hours. The evidence and findings also demonstrate that the accused officers acted in a manner inconsistent with the standards of propriety, efficiency, and discipline expected of public servants. Their conduct has disrupted the administrative integrity of the institution and set a negative precedent within their respective capacities. The proven charges reflect a pattern of inefficiency and misconduct, including the deliberate attempt to mislead the inquiry, disregard for procedural norms, and failure to prioritize professional responsibilities. After careful consideration of the inquiry findings, evidence, and the submissions of the accused officers, it is evident that defense of the accused officers lack merit, and the charges stand conclusively proven.

9. **NOW THEREFORE**, I, **Shahida Farrukh Naveed**, Secretary Special Education / Competent Authority in the instant case, after having considered all the aspects, material relating to the case and *for reasons stated herein above*, in exercise of powers vested in me under Section 13(5) read with Section 4 of the Punjab Employees Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Act, 2006, *given the severity of the proven charge of inefficiency and misconduct, while agreeing with the recommendations of the Inquiry Officer, and still taking lenient view*, impose the following penalties upon the accused officers;

| Sr. No. | Name of accused officer | Penalty Imposed |
|---------|--|---|
| 1. | Ms. Sana Ali , Junior Special Education Teacher (BS-16 / PH Field), Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala. | Minor penalty of "Censure" under section 4(1)(a)(i) of the PEEDA Act, 2006. |
| 2. | Mr. Nasir Mehmood , Headmaster (BS-17+10% Special Pay / PH Field), Govt. Special Education Centre, Aroop Town, Gujranwala | Minor penalty of "Censure" under section 4(1)(a)(i) of the PEEDA Act, 2006. |

Shahida 20/3/25
 (SHAHIDA FARRUKH NAVEED)
 SECRETARY to
 GOVT. OF THE PUNJAB
 SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT /
 COMPETENT AUTHORITY

Dated Lahore, the
 March 20th 2025

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 (Special Education)**, Gujranwala to ensure delivery of this order to the accused officers.
4. **Headmistress**, Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad to ensure delivery of this order to the accused officers.
5. **Ms. Sana Ali**, Junior Special Education Teacher (BS-16 / PH Field), Govt. Special Education Centre, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala.
6. **Mr. Nasir Mehmood**, Headmaster (BS-17+10% Special Pay / PH Field), Govt. Special Education Centre, Aroop Town, Gujranwala.
7. PS to Secretary Special Education Department.

[Signature]
 SECTION OFFICER (ESTT.-I)
 SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT