REGISTERED

SEDU/AS/DS/O/261029/1509

SO(Estt)10-509/2013
GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
31-Sher Shah Block New Garden Town,
Lahore
Dated: 29th October, 2026

04299230244

To,

1. ***Sonia Barkat, SSET (VI/BS-17), ex-Incharge Headmistress, Govt. Spl Edu Centre, Alipur.***
2. ***Presently reported to department***

Subject: **SHOW CAUSE-CUM-PERSONAL HEARING NOTICE UNDER SECTION 13(4) OF THE PUNJAB EMPLOYEES, EFFICIENCY, DISCIPLINE AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2006**

WHEREAS, *de novo* inquiry proceedings were initiated against you under Section 5 read with Section 9 of the Punjab Employees, Efficiency, Discipline and Accountability Act, 2006 (**'Act'**) vide order dated 07.04.2026 on the following charges of inefficiency and misconduct by appointing **Mr. Abdul Sattar, Director (Academics / BS-19) Directorate General of Special Education, Punjab, Lahore** as **Inquiry Officer;**

1. The accused officer, Ms. Sonia Barkat, was absent from duty on July 2 and 3, 2024, without prior intimation or approval from the District Education Officer. During the visit of DEO on 03.07.2024, she presented an unsigned OPD slip (OPD No. 1022) dated July 2, 2024, as justification, which lacks any recommendation for medical leave or hospital admission, suggesting possible falsification. Her failure to seek permission for leave, coupled with presenting unverified medical documentation, constitutes a clear case of inefficiency, misconduct, and deceit, demonstrating an intent to mislead her reporting authorities.
2. The accused officer failed to uphold punctuality and discipline among her teaching staff, as evidenced by the frequent late arrivals of teachers under her supervision (Ms. Javeria Zia, Ms. Khalida Ghaffar, and Ms. Rabia Barkat) according to biometric attendance records. Despite her general claim of issuing office orders, her neglect to issue targeted warnings or explanations contributed to persistent laten comings among her team, reflecting inefficiency in leadership and supervision.
3. The accused officer herself exhibited frequent late arrivals, as recorded in the school's biometric system. Biometric attendance data from the month of February 2024 shows that, in the month of February, she arrived late on the 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, and 28th. In March, the dates were 1st, 7th, 8th, 11th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 22nd, and 28th. In April, she arrived late on the 1st, 3rd, 5th, 6th, 8th, 16th, 22nd, 24th, and 29th. In May, the dates were 3rd, 4th, 6th, 11th, 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th. In June, she was late on the 7th, 13th, and 25th. This lack of punctuality from the officer in charge undermines her role as a leader and disrupts school discipline, as she failed to serve as a positive example for her staff, adversely affecting the school's operational standards.

4. During the visit of DEO on July 3, 2024, the Centre clerk was found absent without a documented leave application. The accused officer failed to produce any record justifying this absence, suggesting an attempt to shield the absent staff member from disciplinary action. Her failure to hold her staff accountable demonstrates inefficiency and misconduct, as she did not enforce attendance policies in alignment with departmental standards.
5. Despite being allocated a budget for Centre relocation, the accused officer continued to operate in an unsafe, century-old building. Her negligence in relocating the Centre to a safer facility shows inefficiency in her duties, jeopardizing the safety and well-being of students and staff, and failing to fulfil her fiduciary responsibility to safeguard departmental resources and stakeholders.
6. A sum exceeding Rs. 1.4 million remains unreconciled in the Centre's bank account under the supervision of the accused officer. Her inability to account for or manage these funds effectively demonstrates inefficiency in her fiscal responsibilities, compromising transparency and accountability in her role as the Centre in-charge.
7. In her capacity as chair of the Bid Evaluation Committee, the accused officer breached financial regulations and General Financial Rules by failing to invite committee members for the physical count of uniforms. She issued a technical inspection certificate and distributed uniforms without proper verification, raising suspicions of mis-procurement and irregularities in distribution.
8. The accused officer failed to follow established procurement principles during the uniform procurement process, issuing inconsistent and inaccurate supply orders on January 16, 2024, to M/s Ideal Enterprises and M/s Nadeem Brothers that did not match actual demand. Despite both vendors failing to fulfil orders, the accused officer neither blacklisted the firms nor extended the validity period of the procurement process as required. Moreover, the accused officer also failed to obtain a performance guarantee from M/s Nadeem Brothers. Uniforms were not delivered to special students on time, resulting in a delayed disbursement two days before school closure.
9. The accused officer uploaded the tender on October 3, 2023, with a deadline for October 18, 2023, yet failed to complete the procurement within the bid validity period, which expired two months after bid opening on November 17, 2024. The accused officer did not initiate re-tendering but continued with the expired tender, contrary to Clause 1(f) of the PPRA Rules, 2014.
10. The necessary performance guarantee was not obtained, and show-cause notices to the non-compliant bidders were not issued as required by Clause 21 of PPRA Rules 2014.
11. A supply order issued to M/s Nadeem Brothers on January 16, 2024, was valued at Rs. 654,122 instead of correct Rs. 409,300, *(the supply order was with mismatch totals that did not align with record)* resulting in discrepancies that do not align with actual uniform demand.
12. A subsequent supply order was issued to M/s Nadeem Brothers on April 18, 2024, despite prior non-compliance by the said firm.
13. The technical inspection certificate dated May 22, 2024, was issued without lab testing, contrary to Clause 7(a)-(d) of the tender document requirements. No committee members other than the accused officer signed the Technical Inspection Report. The certificate of conformity was issued before lab test results, raising concerns about the transparency and validity of the process.
14. You failed to ensure proper sizing specifications for uniforms prior to supply, leading to suspected manipulation of uniform sizes with an inflated demand for larger sizes. The enrolment data indicates a discrepancy between the ordered and actual demand by size category, leading to potential embezzlement.

15. Supply records, including the uniform disbursement register, lack necessary information and signatures, raising doubts regarding record authenticity. The requirement to maintain proper documentation and oversight of the procurement process was not met, leading to accountability issues.
16. The accused officer incurred an expenditure of Rs. 557,817 under various heads of accounts in the last quarter of 2023, excluding uniforms, petrol, and stipends, with a significant portion spent after the summer vacation period. When requested to provide records or documentation for items purchased, the accuse officer failed to present any. A substantial number of items remain unaccounted for, suggesting misappropriation of funds without any requisitions from relevant staff.
17. As per Bill No. 334 dated February 23, 2024, the accused officer authorized the purchase of two uniforms for the Centre driver, including trousers, a shirt, and a cap. The cost of black shoes was inflated to Rs. 5,000, which is not justified. The accused officer also purchased a Peshawari Chappal for the driver at Rs. 5,500, which does not conform to the Centre dress code and suggests misappropriation of funds.
18. The accused officer authorized the purchase of two tires for the Centre bus under Bill Nos. 392 and 393 dated April 15, 2024, each for Rs. 49,914, without prior inspection by the Motor Vehicle Examination or a requisition from the driver.
19. The logbook and vehicle history sheet also lack details on the mileage covered by the old tires, raising suspicion regarding the necessity of these purchases and potential misuse of public funds through bill splitting.
20. A total of Rs. 44,250 was withdrawn under Object Code A9201 for computer hardware, with unsupported bills for items that do not qualify as hardware, such as consumable printer cartridges. No cartridges are recorded as available despite claims of use. Furthermore, repeated purchases of keyboards and mouse, despite having only one computer, lack justification and suggest potential embezzlement.
21. The accused officer withdrew Rs. 60,000 for furniture repairs through three bills of Rs. 20,000 each, citing work descriptions for polishing benches that were not validated by requisitions or school staff. Cross-verification with school staff confirmed no such repairs were performed, indicating that these claims were fabricated and funds misappropriated.
22. Bill No. 21 dated December 14, 2023, authorized purchases of flashcards, worksheets, and colour pencils totalling Rs. 44,840, yet these items were not available during inspection, despite their entry in stock records.
23. A separate purchase of five decorative plants for Rs. 35,400 under Bill No. 344 dated April 4, 2024, also yielded no physical items during inspection. Additional consumable items under Bill Nos. 344, 407, and 408 reflect misclassification and misappropriation totalling Rs. 115,805 across multiple accounts.

2. **AND WHEREAS,** the Inquiry Officer, after finalizing the inquiry proceedings, has submitted inquiry report to this department **(copy of Inquiry Report is attached)**. The Inquiry Officer has recommended imposition of minor penalty of ***Censure*** upon the accused officer.

3. **AND WHEREAS**, in view of the above, you are liable to be imposed one or more penalties in terms of Section 4 of the Act *ibid* for the charge against you.

4. **NOW THEREFORE**, in exercise of the powers conferred upon me as Competent Authority under Section 13(4) of the Act *ibid*, you are hereby called upon to show cause within seven **(07)** days of the receipt of this notice as to why one or more penalties as prescribed under Section 4

of the Act *ibid* may not be imposed upon you. You are allowed to submit additional defense in writing, if any.

5. You are also afforded an opportunity of personal hearing and directed to appear before the undersigned on **10.11.2026 (Tuesday) at 10:30 a.m.** for this purpose. If you fail to appear, the case shall be decided *ex-parte*.

(SHOAIB IQBAL SYED)
SECRETARY
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

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

1. District Education Officer ; (D G Khan)
   Directorate General of Special Education
2. ***2. Deputy District Education Officer (Special Education), D.G Khan / Departmental Representative.***
3. ***Deputy District Education Officer (Special Education), D.G Khan / Departmental Representative.***
4. Private Secretary
   Special Education Department