

**ORDER**

No.SO(Estt)10-105/2006. WHEREAS, Director General Special Education, Punjab, Lahore ('DGSE') vide note dated 12.04.2023 intimated that she visited Govt. Secondary School of Special Education for Hearing Impaired, Kasur on 15.03.2023. During the visit, **Mr. Latif Ahmad**, Headmaster (HI Field / BS-18), Govt. Secondary School of Special Education for Hearing Impaired, Kasur ('accused officer') was found absent from duty without any prior approval from the authority; that the accused officer failed to perform his duties in befitting manner and consequent thereupon, due to his inefficiency, administrative matters of Govt. Secondary School of Special Education for Hearing Impaired, Kasur, *including but not limited to*, cleanliness of the school, poor administration of staff, poor condition of the building, non-provision of uniforms to the special students, absence of staff without approval/sanctioning of leave, non-observance of punctuality by staff, and protection of valuable equipment of audiological clinic & lab have been not properly handled. It has further been brought into notice that an explanation was issued to the accused officer to explain his position but he failed to file reply of the same which shows his careless attitude and also depicts that his conduct is unbecoming of an officer.

2. **AND WHEREAS**, keeping in view the facts of the case and on account of availability of sufficient documentary evidence on record, *while dispensing regular inquiry*, disciplinary proceedings against the accused officer were initiated vide Show Cause Notice dated 06.06.2023 under Section 7(b) read with Section 5(1)(a) of the Act *ibid* on the following charges of misconduct and inefficiency:

- i. *You have been found absent from your duty on 15.03.2023 without prior permission / approval of leave by the Competent Authority.*
- ii. *Your leave account was not available in the school.*
- iii. *Due to your inefficiency and loose administration out of total 39 staff members, only 08 teaching and 04 non-teaching staff were present till 08:30 AM. Whereas, 03 teachers came late after 08:30 AM and marked their attendance.*
- iv. *Due to your inefficiency and negligence, day supervisory teachers i.e., Ms. Zahida Nazir & Mr. Shafeel Ahmad Naz were also found absent.*
- v. *Cleanliness condition of the school was pathetic. Furniture was scattered in the classrooms and was giving a gloomy look.*
- vi. *Many rooms were locked and were dumped with scattered material, food leftovers, crockery and furniture.*
- vii. *Library and audiological clinic / lab were closed and dumped with unnecessary material since ages which caused wastage of valuable equipment of audiological clinic and lab due to being non-operational.*
- viii. *Windows/grills of the schools were broken and food leftover were placed in widow sheds.*
- ix. *Due to your inefficiency uniform was not being provided to students since last three years.*
- x. *Psychologist of the school had not maintained work planner since January, 2023 which shows your loose supervisory control.*

Lainna Saeed

- xi. Wall charts were torn and hanging unpleasantly.  
xii. Your explanation was called but you did not pay any heed and failed to file reply.

3. **AND WHEREAS**, through the above said Show Cause Notice, the accused officer was directed to submit his defence reply within 07-days. Accordingly, the accused officer filed written reply which was examined and found unsatisfactory, hence, in order to finalize the disciplinary proceedings, vide letter dated 22.06.2023, **Additional Secretary**, Special Education was appointed Hearing Officer, under Section 7 (d) of the Act *ibid*, to afford an opportunity of personal hearing to the accused officer and the accused officer was directed to appear before the Hearing Officer on 13.07.2023 for hearing proceedings.

4. **AND WHEREAS**, the Hearing Officer after affording opportunities of personal hearing to the accused officer on 13.07.2023 and 19.07.2023, submitted report of hearing proceedings stating therein that during the course of hearing, the accused officer while reiterating the stance already taken by him in written defence requested that he may be exonerated from the charge. Whereas, the Deputy Director (Admn), Directorate General of Special Education, Punjab, Lahore / Departmental Representative presented all the record pertaining to the case and submitted that except charge No. 1 and 12 all charges are proved through record, hence the accused officer is liable to be penalized for his delinquency.

5. **AND WHEREAS**, after hearing the accused officer, examining the written defence of the accused officer and documents annexed therewith and considering the material related to the case, the Hearing Officer observed as under;

**“Charge No. 1:**

*It is admitted position that the accused officer was not present in the institute on the day of visit but alongwith the written reply, the accused officer has attached copy of application for grant of casual leave for two days i.e. 14.03.2023 and 15.03.2023 addressed to District Education Officer (Special Education), Lahore dated 13.03.2023. Another letter written by DEO (SE), Lahore dated 21.03.2023 is attached through which receipt of leave application of the accused officer is confirmed. In light of these documents, it is concluded that the accused officer was on leave which was approved by the authority concerned. Hence, the charge is not proved.*

**Charge No. 2:**

*The accused officer has asserted in his reply that his leave account is being maintained in the office of DEO (SE), Lahore. During the course of hearing, the accused officer was asked whether any record has been maintained by him regarding the casual leaves availed? In response, he stated that at the time of visit no such record was available but now the record of leave / leave account is maintained. This fact is sufficient to show that the charge is proved.*

**Charge No. 3:**

*The accused officer has stated that he was on leave (which was duly approved) on the day of visit, therefore, he cannot comment on late arrival / absence of staff. During the course of hearing, the accused officer was asked what steps he took when he came to know about the late arrival / absence of staff on 15.03.2023? In response, he stated that attendance is being marked on bio-matric machine and a direction was also issued to all staff vide office order dated 28.02.2023 for compliance of school timings. After the visit, he again directed all*

*Laminated*

concerned to strictly observe school timings as notified by the department.

It is admitted position that absence from duty tantamounts to gross misconduct whereas late arrival without intimation is also not less grave than absence from duty.

On the day of inspection, more than 50% staff (teaching and non-teaching) was either late or absent which cannot by any stretch of imagination happen by chance. It also shows that administrative control of the accused officer is weak.

#### **Charge No. 4:**

Stance of the accused officer is that Mrs. Zahida Nazir who was notified as Supervisory Teacher was present on the day of visit and she marked her attendance on bio-matric machine on 08:14 AM. The accused officer was asked whether Ms. Zahida Nazir is exempted from marking her attendance on manual attendance register? In reply, the accused officer stated that she might have forgot to mark attendance on manual register but she was present.

It is observed that the reply of the accused officer does not seem justified as DGSE visited the institute at around 08:20 AM and if Ms. Zahida Nazir was available/present she should have met DGSE and being supervisory teacher on the said day, in the absence of the accused officer, should have apprised DGSE about the affairs of the school.

It is further observed that the accused officer was not present on the day of visit, therefore, his stance is based on assumptions and it also appears that his stance is an attempt to protect Ms. Zahida Nazir.

With regards to absence of Mr. Shafeel Ahmad Naz, the accused officer stated that he was deputed on Census Duty 2023. The accused officer was asked if he was aware that Mr. Shafeel Ahmad Naz has been deputed on Census Duty then why he did not replace his name with any other teacher? The accused officer was unable to give any satisfactory response.

#### **Charge No. 5:**

It is observed that the justification accorded by the accused officer in reply to this charge is nothing more than a story built to cover-up the lacunas. It was observed by the DGSE on the day of visit that cleanliness condition of the school was not up to the mark and furniture was scattered. The accused officer failed to give any plausible justification.

#### **Charge No. 6:**

In reply to this charge, stance of the accused officer is based on misconception. It has been admitted by the accused officer that rooms were locked and the reason stated by the accused officer cannot be termed as justified because even if annual exams were ongoing, the room should have been unlocked.

With regards to presence of food leftovers, crockery and the rooms being dumped with furniture, the reply of the accused is even not satisfactory. Moreover, the accused officer has stated in his reply that he has noted this observation for future compliance which tantamounts to admission.

Laina Saeed

**Charge No. 7:**

The reply of the accused officer in reply to this charge is as under;  
"Mrs. Aneeqa Faisal, SSET (HI) and Mrs. Chanda Noreen, Audiometerist are holding charge of the Library and Audiological Clinic, respectively. One or two instance regarding non-maintenance of equipment was rightly observed. Library and Audiological clinic and Lab are now functional on the basis of available sources. However, above said lady officers were directed to ensure maintenance of equipment and fully functional of the two offices vide office order dated 18.03.2023."

The reply of the accused officer is self sufficient to establish the charge and does not warrant further deliberation.

**Charge No. 8:**

The reply of the accused officer to the extent of placing the case of upgradation in ADP Scheme is justified but to the extent of presence of food leftovers in window sheds, is unsatisfactory and proves that being supervisory officer the accused officer is not performing his duties in a befitting manner.

**Charge No. 9:**

Reply of the accused officer shows that he is mindful of the fact that it is first and foremost duty to ensure delivery of uniform to the special students. But due to financial constraints, non-release of budget by CEO (DEA), Kasur and centralized procurement the uniform could not be distributed for last three years. It is observed that attention of DGSE is required in this issue for appropriate directions to all concerned to take necessary measures in this regard.

**Charge No. 10:**

The reply of the accused officer to this charge is as under;

"Explanation of the Psychologist has been called on 17.03.2023. In response thereto, she has stated that due to complaints and maladjustment and misbehavior of majority of students in classes, it was unanimously decided by the teachers, parents and allied staff that their behavior issues require group sessions. Art and craft therapy sessions were planned after consideration of student's aptitude. It was a three months sessions plan. When the visit was made by the DG (SE), session was continued and the children with special needs were guided to use raw material for making it useful from newspaper, wasted charts and wood dust material etc. and at sight, it all looked quite messy."

The above quoted reply shows that the charge is based on facts and the same is proved.

**Charge No. 11:**

The accused officer in his reply stated that the torn charts have been replaced which shows that torn charts were hanging on the day of visit and no effort was made to take them off. It is further observed that veracity of this charge is not disputed by the accused officer.

**Charge No. 12:**

As per record and statement of Director (Admn), Directorate General of Special Education, the accused officer filed reply to explanation and

Saima Saeed

there-after he was issued warning by DGSE. Hence, the charge is not proved.”

6. **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, reveals that the accused officer was on approved leave on the day of visit but his leave account was neither maintained in the school nor available at the time of visit. The staff of the school was also not present and some staff members came late. In the absence of the accused officer, the day supervisory teachers were not available and the reason accorded by the accused officer regarding their absence is indeed unsatisfactory. The accused officer also failed to give plausible reasons with regards to cleanliness condition of the school and as to why the rooms were locked and were dumped with scattered material, food leftovers, crockery and furniture. It is further observed that reply of the accused officer with regards to charge No. 8, 10 and 11 is self-sufficient to prove the charges. Record fully corroborates that the accused officer being supervisory officer failed to discharge his duties in a befitting manner. It is further noticed that except charge No.1, 9 and 12 all the charges stood proved against the accused officer which shows that the accused officer showed inefficiency towards performance of his duties.

7. **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*, 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  
August 16<sup>th</sup> /2023

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) Lahore.
4. Accused Officer concerned.
5. PS to Secretary Special Education Department.
6. Master file.



SECTION OFFICER (ESTT.)  
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT