

**IN THE SUPREME APPELLATE COURT GILGIT-BALTISTAN,
GILGIT.**

Before:-

**Mr. Justice Dr. Rana Muhammad Shamim, Chief Judge.
Mr. Justice Javed Iqbal, Judge.**

Civil Misc. No. 08/2013

In

SMC. No. 13/2010.

(SAP SCHOOL TEACHERS).

PRESENT:-

1. The Deputy Attorney General for Pakistan at Gilgit-Baltistan on behalf of the Ministry of Federal Education & Professional Training, Islamabad.
2. The Advocate General Gilgit-Baltistan on behalf of the Provincial Government of Gilgit-Baltistan.
3. Mr. Amjad Hussain Advocate alongwith Mr. Ali Nazar Khan Advocate-on-Record on behalf of the SAP School Teachers.
4. Mr. Manzoor Ahmed Kacho Director BECS Gilgit-Baltistan.

DATE OF HEARING: - 18.10.2016.

ORDER.

In pursuance of the order dated 12.05.2016 of this court a report has been submitted by Ministry of Federal Education & Professional Training Directorate General of Basic Education Community Schools, Government of Pakistan.

2. We have heard the learned counsels for the respective parties at length and gone through the aforementioned report. The learned Deputy Attorney General for Pakistan at Gilgit-Baltistan submits that the teachers were paid honorarium not the salary in accordance with the academic qualification of the SAP Schools Teachers as per policy of Government of Pakistan. He also submits that the services of some of the employees/SAP School Teachers were regularized on the basis of the criteria of their eligibility in line

with the Office Memorandum No. 10/30/2008-R-II dated August, 29, 2008 issued by the Cabinet Secretariate, Establishment Division Islamabad. The learned Deputy Attorney General further submits that no case for taking Suo Moto notice was made out which constrained this court to take cognizance. The aggrieved person, if any, may approach the concerned competent authorities for redressal of their grievances if so advised. The learned Advocate General supports the above contentions of the learned Deputy Attorney General.

3. Mr. Amjad Hussain learned counsel appearing on behalf of the SAP School Teachers lukewarmly concedes to take up the case with the concerned authorities. He contends that since the matter was taken up by this apex court six years ago, therefore, it may be considered as continuation of proceedings/grievances and they may not be debarred on the question of limitation. The request is allowed. The representation or departmental appeals, if so filed by the effectees be entertained and decided in its own merits.

4. In view of the above discussions, this Suo Moto Case is disposed off in above terms.

Chief Judge.

Judge.

Whether the case is fit to be reported or not?