JUDGMENT SHEET
IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD.
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

W.P.No.2133 of 2005
Abdul Ghaffar Khan Lodhi and others
Versus
Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and others

Date of Hearing: 07.06.2017
Petitioners by: Ch. Mumtaz Ali, Rifaqat Islam Awan, Fiaz Ahmad Jandran, Muhammad Mehboob Alam, Syed Zafar Ali Shah, Muhammad Saleem, Shaista Tabussam Khan Sultanpuri, Raja Muhammad Anwar-ul-Haq, Abdul Ghanni Channa, and Javed Saleem Shorish, Advocates.
Respondents by: M/s Muhammad Izzat Khan, Dr. Muhammad Aslam Khaki, Yasmin Haider, Amjad Iqbal Qureshi, Qazi Rafi-ud-Din Babar, and Mian Omer Riaz, Advocates.
Mr. Altaf Hayat Khan, Law Officer, F.G.E.H.F.

MIANGUL HASSAN AURANGZEB, J:- Through this judgment, we propose to decide the writ petitions listed in **"Schedule-A"** hereto.

2. It is appropriate to give a recital as to the background of the dispute before us. On 10.06.1996, the Land Acquisition Collector, Islamabad ("L.A.C.") issued a notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 ("the 1894 Act"), for the acquisition of land in villages Maira Akko and Maira Jaffar, which form part of Sector G-13, Islamabad. As the land was required on an urgent basis, on 23.11.1996, a notification under Section 17(4) of the 1894 Act, was published for the acquisition of land in the said villages for the use of Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation ("F.G.E.H.F."). Before the announcement of the award, owners of land in the said villages filed writ petition No.338/1999, titled "Gulshan Hussain etc. Vs. Commissioner (Revenue) Islamabad, etc" before the Hon'ble Lahore High Court, challenging the said notifications.

3. With the intended purpose of developing a housing scheme in Sector G-13, Islamabad, the F.G.E.H.F. collected funds from

applicants for the allotment of plots. An amount of Rs.300 Million collected from such applicants was placed at the disposal of Deputy Commissioner, Islamabad, for the payment as compensation to the land owners. Possession of the land was also said to have been taken over from the land owners under Section 11 of the 1894 Act.

4. The position taken by the petitioners in writ petition No.338/1999, was to the effect that acquisition of private land for the benefit of the limited class of individuals could not be termed as "public purpose", and that private owners of land could not be deprived of their ownership rights for the purpose of creating and allotting residential plots for the benefit of the members of F.G.E.H.F. Vide order dated 06.08.1999, the Hon'ble High Court, admitted the said writ petition for regular hearing, but did not restrain the continuation of the land acquisition proceedings. Vide judgment dated 08.11.1999, the Hon'ble High Court, held *inter alia* as follows:-

> *"24. The acquisition of land for a Housing Scheme introduced by the Housing Foundation for public utility in the form of an Agency like Capital Development Authority under the control of Federal Government and if such scheme is executed in the benefit of public at large and is not confined to a limited class, it will definitely advance the spirit of Constitution. Therefore, the acquisition of the land by the Housing Foundation for the benefit of all the above referred categories of persons can be for the "Public Purpose" and the same will not be in violation of Article 24 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan 1973, which do not prevent establishment of Housing Colonies in the public interest."*

5. Furthermore, the Hon'ble High Court held that the acquisition of land for the establishment of a housing scheme in Sector G-13, Islamabad was valid. The issue relating to the inadequacy of compensation and non-payment of compensation was left to be decided by the L.A.C. while announcing the award, and through the alternative remedies provided under the law. The said writ petition was disposed of with a number of directions. For the purposes of this case, the following direction given by the Hon'ble High Court is of relevance:-

> *"(ix) That a special allocation of residential plots was made by the C.D.A. for the lawyers on the shifting of Supreme Court to*

> *Islamabad in 1974 and, thereafter no such facility was provided for the lawyers, therefore, like Journalist and employees of Autonomous Bodies, the lawyers who normally practice in the Supreme Court of Pakistan at Islamabad including the Law Officers of the Federal and the Provincial Government, who are attached with the superior Courts as well as the* ***lawyers of the District Courts at Islamabad shall be considered for a special allocation in Sector G-13 and Sector G-14 at the disposal of the Ministry of Law and Parliamentary Affairs****.*
> (Emphasis added)

6. Subsequently, Criminal Original Petition No.1-W/2000 titled, "Gulshan Hussain Vs. Director General, F.G.E.H.F." was filed before the Hon'ble High Court, Rawalpindi Bench. The position taken by the petitioner in the said petition was that F.G.E.H.F. had failed to give effect to the directions given by the Hon'ble High Court in the judgment dated 08.11.1999. The said petition was disposed of by the Hon'ble High Court by observing *inter alia* that F.G.E.H.F. *"will allocate a special quota of residential plots for each category as mentioned in the short order in the next housing scheme for disposal through their respective institutions."*

7. On 08.01.2004, F.G.E.H.F. published an advertisement in Daily Jang inviting applications from eligible persons for the allotment of plots in Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F.'s housing scheme located in Ramna-14 (Sector G-14, Zone-I, Islamabad). This scheme consisted of three sub-sectors i.e. G-14/1, G-14/2, and G-14/3. It was spread over an area measuring 608 acres, which was in the process of being acquired under the provisions of the 1894 Act. The C.D.A. is set to have already accorded an in-principal approval for the said scheme. The said scheme was to have plots of different sizes ranging from 111 Sq. Yards to 500 Sq. Yards. It is not disputed that the last date for the submission of applications for the allotment of plots was 29.02.2004. The form of the application was set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. Although the total number of plots in the said housing scheme was not known, 5 % of the residential plots were to be allotted to various categories of applicants who were *"employees of constitutional bodies/professionals"*. The explanatory notes in the said brochure provided that the term

"professionals" included, *"members of the Islamabad District Courts Bar Association".* Law officers of the Federation posted in the Hon'ble High Court, Rawalpindi Bench and the Hon'ble Supreme Court were also stated to come within the meaning of *"professionals"*. The entitlement of the applicants with respect to their basic pay scales was as under:-

Category	BPS or Equivalent	Tentative Size of Plot
I	20-22	50'x90'
II	18-19	40'x80'
III	16-17	35'x70'
IV	11-15	30'x60'
V	1-10	25'x40'

8. As per clause 2.2 of the brochure, applications could be submitted for allotment of a category of plot lower than the applicant's entitlement. It was explicitly stated in the said brochure that an *"option once exercised cannot be changed"*. Clause 6 of the brochure required the applicants to submit their applications along with bank drafts or pay orders for an amount prescribed in the brochure for the category of plot applied for.

9. Vide letter dated 22.03.2005, F.G.E.H.F. informed the President of the Islamabad District Bar Association that in compliance with the modified judgment dated 15.03.2000, passed by the Hon'ble Lahore High Court, a separate quota had been kept for lawyers of the Islamabad Bar Association ("I.B.A.") in Phase-IV of the Housing Scheme. The quota was as follows:-

Category-I	02 plots
Category-II	09 plots
Category-III	07 plots
Category-IV	14 plots
Category-V	10 plots
Total	**42 plots**

10. It is not disputed that the number of lawyers/applicants for the five different categories of plots, who submitted their applications to F.G.E.H.F. within the deadline, were as follows:-

Category-I	46 applicants
Category-II	69 applicants
Category-III	22 applicants
Category-IV	14 applicants
Category-V	04 applicants
Total	**155 applicants**

11. There were a total number of 155 applicants for a total number of 42 plots. The F.G.E.H.F. compiled a list of lawyers/applicants who had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of specific categories of plots against the professional quota. This list is in accordance with the age-wise seniority of each applicant/lawyer. For instance, Mr. Sher Muhammad, born on 20.10.1925, is at Sr. No.1 of the list of applicants for category-I plots, whereas Malik Muhammad Nawaz, born on 01.04.1934, is at Sr. No.2. There were only two category-I plots available for allotment to lawyers. Although the total number of applicants/lawyers for category-I plots are 46, if such plots were to be allotted to the applicants on the basis of age-wise seniority, then only the above named two learned counsel would be entitled for allotment. The number of applicants for plots of all categories (except for categories-IV and V), were in excess of the number of plots available for allotment. For instance, there were 69 applicants for the 09 available category-II plots, and there were 46 applicants for the 02 available category-I plots. A peculiar feature regarding category-IV plots is that the total number of applicants for plots in the said category are 14, whereas the total number of available category-IV plots are also 14. For the 10 available plots in category-V, there were only 04 applicants.

12. As per clause 2.1 of the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F., for allotments of plots to *"widows of those eligible Federal Government Employees (of Ministries/Divisions and Attached Departments and Subordinate Offices) who died during service"* the length of service of the deceased employee was the criteria. Allotments of plots for the following categories of applicants were to be made according to age-wise seniority:-

> ***"- Employees of Federal Ministries/Divisions/Attached Departments & their subordinate offices (declared as such and included in the Rules of Business), Members of Regularly constituted groups/services of the Federal Government, and Members of Superior Judiciary i.e. Judges of Supreme Court, High Courts and Federal Shariat Court who were in service on 15.11.2003.***
>
> ***- Employees of Autonomous/Semi Autonomous Government Organization and Public Sector Corporations under***

the Administrative Control of Federal Government who were in the service on 15.11.2003.
- Retired Federal Government Employees of Ministries/Divisions/Attached Departments and Subordinate Offices.

13. The said brochure does not provide a criteria for the allotment of plots to *"employees of Constitutional Bodies / Professionals"*. This omission was the prime cause of the disputes between certain members of the legal fraternity, who were members of the I.B.A. These disputes were exacerbated when F.G.E.H.F. sent the above mentioned letter dated 22.03.2005 to the President of the I.B.A. seeking his recommendation for allotment of plots in different categories.

14. The applicants for allotment of plots in category-IV addressed an undated letter to the Director General, F.G.E.H.F. complaining about the delay in the issuance of allotment letters to the said applicants. In the said letter, it was stated that once an applicant had exercised an option for a plot of a certain category, the same could not be changed. It was also stated that there were 14 applicants for the 14 category-IV available plots. Vide letter dated 15.06.2005, F.G.E.H.F. informed the said 14 applicants that F.G.E.H.F. had already forwarded the list of all the applicants to the I.B.A to make recommendations for allotment of plots to the Advocates; and that F.G.E.H.F. was waiting for a reply from the I.B.A. The said fourteen applicants were advised to contact the I.B.A.

15. The I.B.A. vide letter dated 06.07.2005 informed F.G.E.H.F. that the general body and executive body of the I.B.A. had decided to recommend for allotment of different categories of residential plots in Sector G-14, Islamabad, names of lawyers as per their seniority maintained by the I.B.A. This list is set out in **"Schedule-B"** hereto.

16. Vide letter wrongly dated as 11.06.2005, a number of Advocates including the ones who had applied for allotment of plots within the due date, submitted their objections to the list of lawyers submitted by the I.B.A. to F.G.E.H.F. In the said letter, it was *inter-alia* stated that the recommendations for allotment of

plots made by the I.B.A. were inconsistent with the terms and conditions set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. It was also stated that the President of the I.B.A. had no right or authority to fix a criteria for allotment of plots in violation of F.G.E.H.F.'s rules and regulations.

17. Vide letter dated 13.08.2005, F.G.E.H.F. informed the President of the I.B.A. that the examination of the list of lawyers to whom plots were recommended to be allotted by the I.B.A. showed that categories of various applicants had been changed both downward and upward, and that the persons recommended for all the five categories had been totally ignored. Furthermore, the I.B.A. was requested to provide a justification for the said treatment.

18. In response to F.G.E.H.F.'s letter dated 13.08.2005, the President of the I.B.A., vide letter dated 20.09.2010 informed F.G.E.H.F. that since there were only 14 applicants for the 14 available category-IV plots, the I.B.A. would have no objection if the said 14 plots were allotted to the 14 applicants/lawyers. It is our view that through this letter the I.B.A. has conveyed its tacit acceptance to the terms and conditions of the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. especially the condition that the *"option once exercised shall not be changed"*, and also that only those lawyers who had actually applied to the F.G.E.H.F. for a particular category of plot could have been allotted plots of that category, and not those who had not. Additionally, the position taken by the I.B.A. in the said letter dated 20.09.2010 is tantamount to a negation of the recommendations made by I.B.A. to F.G.E.H.F. in the letter dated 06.07.2005. Perusal of the said letter dated 20.09.2010 shows that at no material stage did the I.B.A. provide any justification for changing the categories of various applicants both upward as well as downward in the list of lawyers recommended for the allotment of plots. By changing the categories of the various applicants, the I.B.A. ignored the restriction upon the change of the option for the allotment of a plot of particular category by an applicant.

19. In the period between 2005 and 2009, nine writ petitions listed in **"Schedule-A"** hereto were filed before the Hon'ble High Court. We shall come to the details of these writ petitions at a later stage. For the moment, suffice it to say that said writ petitions were disposed of vide judgment dated 04.04.2013, passed by Division Bench of this Court with the direction to F.G.E.H.F. to implement the judgment passed by Hon'ble Lahore High Court in the case of "Gulshan Hussain etc. Vs. Commissioner (Revenue) Islamabad, etc" and allocate a quota for advocates in accordance with the said judgment and the order passed in Criminal Original Petition No.1-W/2000. The said judgment dated 04.04.2013 was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Vide order dated 16.02.2017, the said judgment dated 04.04.2013 was set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and the matter was remanded to this Court for a decision afresh.

20. Nine members of the I.B.A. had filed Writ Petition No.2133/2005 before the Hon'ble Lahore High Court, Rawalpindi Bench, praying for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to issue allotment letters to the petitioners in the said writ petition. The petitioners in the said writ petition were amongst the 14 applicants who had applied for allotment of plots in category-IV. The primary ground taken in the said writ petition was that since there were only 14 applicants for the 14 available category-IV plots, and since the terms of the brochure did not permit a change in the option exercised by an applicant for a particular category of a plot, there was no reason for F.G.E.H.F. to have referred the matter regarding the allotment of the category-IV plots to the I.B.A.

21. The said writ petition was contested by the I.B.A. The position taken by the I.B.A. was that there was no criteria set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of plots to lawyers; that prior to the submission of applications for allotment of plots, F.G.E.H.F. had not disclosed the total number of plots reserved for allotment to the members of the I.B.A.; that the terms and conditions of the brochure regarding allotment of plots to the applicants from general quota were not applicable to the special quota reserved for lawyers; that the I.B.A. was

justified in forwarding a list of lawyers to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of plots; that the I.B.A. was the only authority competent to prepare such a list and recommend the names of senior lawyers for allotment of plots; that the recommendations made by I.B.A. to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of plots to lawyers was on the basis of a decision taken by the Executive Body and the General Body of I.B.A.; and that the petitioners in Writ Petition No.2133/2005 were junior lawyers who could not be allotted plots simply because they had submitted applications for allotment of plots in a particular category.

22. F.G.E.H.F. had also filed its written comments in Writ Petition No.2133/2005. In the said written comments, it was *inter-alia* pleaded that since the list of 42 lawyers recommended by the I.B.A. for the allotment of plots, did not include the names of the petitioners, F.G.E.H.F. could not redress the grievances of the petitioners; that F.G.E.H.F., as per the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court would only issue allotment letters to the applicants whose names were to be recommended by the I.B.A.; that F.G.E.H.F. had nothing to do with finalizing the list of lawyers to whom allotments were to be made; and that in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F, there was no criteria for the allotment of plots to lawyers.

23. The learned counsel for the petitioners in writ petition No.2133/2005, and the learned counsel for the I.B.A. and F.G.E.H.F. made their submissions in reiteration of their pleadings, details whereof are given hereinabove. The written comments of F.G.E.H.F. in the other connected writ petitions are identical to the to F.G.E.H.F.'s written comments in writ petition No.2133/2005. The private respondents did not file written comments in any of the writ petitions.

24. On behalf of the respondents (who had not applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of plots, and whose names were not mentioned in the list of applicants/lawyers forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to I.B.A along with F.G.E.H.F.'s letter dated 22.03.2005) it was submitted that the most rational criteria for selecting lawyers for allotment of plots in Phase-IV of

F.G.E.H.F.'s housing scheme was seniority of a lawyer in the legal profession; that even though such a criteria was not set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. for selecting lawyers for the allotment of plots, the same should be read into the terms and conditions set out in the said brochure; that the senior members of the I.B.A. should be given category-I plots, whereas junior members should be given plots in a lower category, regardless of whether or not they applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of plots; that the categorization of plots in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. applied only to Government servants and not to lawyers, who are not given grades; that the applicants/lawyers who submitted applications to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of plots did not have any preferential rights over the senior members of I.B.A., who were entitled to be allotted plots; that since the Hon'ble Lahore High Court had directed that the members of the I.B.A. were to be allotted plots through its institution i.e. the I.B.A., the lawyers named in the list submitted by the I.B.A. to F.G.E.H.F. should have been allotted plots.

25. We have heard the contentions of the learned counsel for the contesting parties and have perused the record with their able assistance. The facts leading to the filing of the writ petitions proposed to be disposed of through this judgment, have been set out in sufficient detail in paragraphs 2 to 22 above, and need not be recapitulated.

26. Now the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. with respect to Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F. housing scheme located in Sectors G-14/1, G-14/2, and G-14/3, Islamabad, contains the salient features of the said housing scheme, and more importantly the terms and conditions on which the allocation and distribution of plots in the said scheme were to take place. Under clause 1.1 (c) of the said brochure, *"Employees of constitutional bodies/professionals"* were to be allocated 5% of the plots in the said housing scheme. As per clause-4.2 of the said brochure, members of the Islamabad District Courts Bar Association were to be allocated plots in the said scheme. As per the explanatory notes in the said brochure, *"employees of constitutional bodies"* included the

employees of (i) Supreme Court, (ii) High Court (Rawalpindi Bench), (iii) Federal Shariat Court, (iv) Election Commission, (v) Senate Secretariat, and (vi) National Assembly Secretariat. Members of the I.B.A. were one of the five categories of persons included within the meaning of *"professionals"*. As per clause 4.2 of the said brochure, the word *"professionals"* included (i) Judges of the Civil Courts, Islamabad, (ii) employees of the office of the District Collector, Islamabad, (iii) employees of the Housing Foundation, (iv) Law officers of the Federation posted in the High Court (Rawalpindi Bench), and Supreme Court, and (v) members of the Islamabad District Courts Bar Association.

27. When the said brochure was issued, the total number of plots available for allotment to the members of the I.B.A. were not known. As mentioned above, it was through F.G.E.H.F.'s letter dated 22.03.2005, that the President of the I.B.A. was informed that 42 plots in all were allocated for allotment to the members of I.B.A. in Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F.'s housing scheme. Along with the said letter, the list of all those lawyers/applicants who had applied for different categories of plots in the said housing scheme, was also sent to the President of the I.B.A. This list has been compiled on the basis of age wise seniority of every lawyer/applicant. It is not disputed that only the lawyers/applicants whose names are mentioned in the said list had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of plots within the stipulated deadline of 29.02.2004.

28. Although clause 2.1 of the terms and conditions set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. provides that allotment of plots to employees of federal Ministries/Divisions/Attached Departments and their subordinate offices, etc., were to be made according to age wise seniority, there is no provision in the said terms and conditions for allotment of plots to *"professionals"* and or the members of the I.B.A. to be made on the basis of seniority in terms of age. It may also be mentioned that the said clause 2.1 of the terms and conditions provides that the criteria for allotment of plots to widows of those eligible federal government employees who died in service, shall be the

length of service of the deceased employee. F.G.E.H.F. in its written comments filed in the writ petitions under disposal have admitted that no criteria for allotment of plots to the members of the I.B.A. was set by F.G.E.H.F.

29. F.G.E.H.F. in its written comments filed in writ petition No.2133/2005, has pleaded *inter alia* that as per the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court, F.G.E.H.F. will issue allotment letters only to those persons whose names will be recommended by the I.B.A. It has also been pleaded that as per the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court, F.G.E.H.F. has nothing to do with finalizing the list to whom allotments would be made.

30. We have gone through the judgment dated 08.11.1999, passed by the Hon'ble Lahore High Court in writ petition No.338/1999 as well as the order dated 15.03.2000, passed in criminal original petition No.1-W/2000. In the said judgment dated 08.11.1999, it has been directed *inter alia* that *"the lawyers of the District Courts at Islamabad shall be considered for a special allocation in Sector G-13, and Sector G-14 at the disposal of the Ministry of Law, and Parliamentary Affairs"*. As regards the said order dated 15.03.2000, the Hon'ble Lahore High Court *inter alia* directed that F.G.E.H.F. *"will allocate a special quota of residential plots for each category as mentioned in the short order in the next housing scheme for disposal through their respective institutions"*. In the said judgment dated 08.11.1999, the Hon'ble Lahore High Court had directed F.G.E.H.F. to extend the benefit of F.G.E.H.F.'s housing scheme under execution to all such employees, whether civil servants or not, who were directly or indirectly discharging the functions in connection with the affairs of the Federation and Federal Government and constitutional institutions. F.G.E.H.F. was also directed to consider allotting plots to employees of Election Commission of Pakistan, Supreme Court of Pakistan, Federal Shariat Court, Lahore High Court (Rawalpindi Bench), National Assembly, and other institutions, who were discharging functions in connection with the affairs of the Federation and the Federal Government in Islamabad. It was also directed that senior members of the

armed forces who are normally stationed at their Head Quarters should also be given a special allocation of plots. Doctors and Engineers who were, directly or indirectly, rendering services in their official or semi official capacity at Islamabad were also to be considered for allocation of a special quota in F.G.E.H.F.'s housing scheme. Now, it is our view that the direction of the Hon'ble High Court to F.G.E.H.F. to allocate a special quota of residential plots for each category for disposal "*through their respective institutions",* is relatable to the respective institutions of each category of persons to whom special allocation was to be made by F.G.E.H.F. in compliance with the direction in the said judgment dated 08.11.1999. As mentioned above, these categories include employees of the various Courts, senior members of the armed forces, doctors, engineers, and lawyers/members of I.B.A. The term *"respective institutions"* as regards lawyers/members of the I.B.A., is relatable to the Ministry of Law, and Parliamentary Affairs, as mentioned in the said judgment dated 08.11.1999. The Ministry of Law and Parliamentary Affairs has now been bifurcated. The direction given in the order dated 15.03.2000, does not, in our view, modify or vary the directions given in the said judgment dated 08.11.1999. It certainly does not extinguish the role of the Ministry of Law, and does not give the responsibility for the selection of the allottees of plots to the I.B.A.

31. There was no harm in the F.G.E.H.F. sending the list of applicants for allotment of plots in Phase-IV of the housing scheme to the I.B.A. so that it could be verified whether the applicants in the said list were indeed members of the I.B.A. But F.G.E.H.F. could not leave the matter of selection of the lawyers/applicants for the allotment of plots to the I.B.A. Therefore, we hold that the recommendations sent by the I.B.A. to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of plots to the lawyers mentioned in I.B.A.'s letter dated 06.07.2005, were without lawful authority. Regardless of the fact that the I.B.A. had recommended allotment of plots to lawyers who had not even applied to F.G.E.H.F. and had not deposited the requisite amount in

response to the advertisement dated 08.01.2004, F.G.E.H.F. was not bound to act upon the recommendations of I.B.A.

32. Now the applicants for certain categories of plots are far more than the plots available in those categories. In the ordinary course when the applicants for allotment of plots are more than the plots available for allotment, the selection of the allottees is carried out through balloting. This is so when there is no seniority based for selecting applicants for the allotment of plots. As mentioned above, the terms and conditions set out in the brochure are silent regarding the criteria for the selection of applicants for the allotment of plots specially allocated by F.G.E.H.F. for the members of I.B.A. But for the judgment dated 08.11.1999, passed by the Hon'ble Lahore High Court, F.G.E.H.F. would not have made a special allocation of 42 plots for the members of I.B.A. in Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F.'s housing scheme. Since in the said judgment, it was directed that the special allocation for the members of the I.B.A. would be at the disposal of the Ministry of Law, and Parliamentary Affairs, we feel that the said Ministry would be the best forum to devise a criteria for the selection of the applicants for the allotment of plots, where the number of applicants are in excess of the plots available in a particular category. It would be up to the Ministry of Law, whether to carry out balloting amongst the applicants or to devise a criteria based on seniority in terms of age or in the legal profession for selecting the applicants for the allotment of plots.

33. Since the number of applicants for category-IV plots were exactly the same in number as the available plots in the said category, and since it is not denied that all the 14 applicants for the allotment of category-IV plots were members of the I.B.A., there is no reason to refer the cases of such applicants to the Ministry of Law. Since the number of applicants for category-IV plots is exactly the same that the number of available plots in the said category, it would not make any difference if the applicants were to be selected through balloting or a selection criteria based on seniority in terms of age or enrollment as an advocate. Whether the criteria for selecting applicants is to be based on

seniority in terms of age or enrollment in the legal profession, the said 14 applicants for category-IV plots would be eligible for allotment of plots. We have already observed that the I.B.A. could not replace the applicants who had applied to F.G.E.H.F. within the stipulated deadline for the allotment of category-IV plots with members of the I.B.A. who had not made such applications. Such non-applicants could not be considered for the allotment of plots. Therefore, there is no reason to refer the cases of applicants for category-IV plots to the Ministry of law.

34. There is also no reason to refer the cases of lawyers/applicants for allotment of category-V plots to the Ministry of Law. This is because there were only 04 applicants for the 10 available plots in category-V. It is not disputed that all the 04 applicants for the category-V plots were members of the I.B.A. Devising a criteria for the selection of applicants for category-V plots would serve no useful purpose. We, therefore, hold that the 14 applicants for the category-IV plots and the 04 applicants for category-V plots are entitled to be allotted plots in the said categories without any further delay.

35. The terms and conditions for the allotment of plots set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. are sacrosanct. No one challenged the terms and conditions of the said brochure before any forum. During the proceedings, it was not denied by any party that the last date for submission of applications for allotment of plots in response to the advertisement dated 08.01.2004, was 29.02.2004. Any person, who did not apply to F.G.E.H.F., and did not deposit the requisite amount by the deadline of 29.02.2004, could not be considered for the allotment of a plot. All those lawyers who did not apply for the allotment of plots to F.G.E.H.F. within the said deadline, had missed the bus, and would have to wait for another housing scheme of F.G.E.H.F. to be launched, which has a quota for lawyers. Additionally, any applicant who applied for a particular category of a plot could not be allotted a plot in another category. The terms and conditions set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. expressly

prohibit the change in the option already exercised by an applicant.

36. Plots in Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F.'s housing scheme are to be allotted in accordance with the terms and conditions of the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F., in the light of the judgment dated 08.11.1999, passed by the Hon'ble Lahore High Court. While exercising constitutional jurisdiction, we cannot alter or re-write the terms and conditions contained in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. regarding Phase-IV of its housing scheme. It is also not within the jurisdiction of this Court to devise a criteria for selecting applicants for allotment of plots where the number of applicants exceed the plots available for allotment.

We shall now deal with each petition before us individually.

Writ Petition No.3366/2005, titled "Abdul Ghani Channa Vs. F.G.E.H.F. etc."

37. Writ petition No.3366/2005 was filed on 17.12.2005. The petitioner in the said writ petition prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to allot a plot to the petitioner on the basis of his seniority in terms of age. The petitioner was aggrieved by the list of lawyers submitted by the I.B.A. to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of plots. The petitioner's name did not find mention in the said list. The petitioner was of the view that allotment of plots to lawyers by F.G.E.H.F. should be on the basis of the lawyers' seniority in terms of age. The petitioner in the said writ petition has not pleaded as to whether he was one of the applicants who applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of a plot within the stipulated deadline. There is no document on the record to show that the said petitioner had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of a plot. The list of lawyers/applicants forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A. along with its letter dated 22.03.2005 did not contain the petitioner's name. Since the said petitioner had not applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of a plot in any category within the stipulated deadline, we hold that the petitioner had no *locus standi* to file this petition. Consequently, this petition is liable to be dismissed, and is dismissed with no order as to costs. However, the petitioner is at liberty to apply to F.G.E.H.F. for the

allotment of a plot in any of its future schemes in which there is a quota reserved for lawyers.

Writ petition No.2133/2005, titled "Abdul Ghaffar Khan Lodhi Vs. F.G.E.H.F. etc."

38. Writ petition No.2133/2005 was filed on 27.07.2005. There are a total of nine writ petitioners in the said writ petition. These petitioners had prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to allot category-IV plots to them. There were a total number of 14 applicants for category-IV plots, who had applied to F.G.E.H.F. within the stipulated deadline. As per F.G.E.H.F.'s letter dated 22.03.2005, there were 14 category-IV plots available for allotment to the members of the I.B.A. The names of all the 14 lawyers/applicants who had applied for category-IV plots are mentioned in the list forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A. along with the said letter dated 22.03.2005. It is not disputed that the said 14 lawyers/applicants (nine out of whom are the petitioners) had deposited the requisite amount with F.G.E.H.F. It is not disputed that all these 14 applicants are members of the I.B.A. No other member of the I.B.A. had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of category-IV plots within the stipulated deadline.

39. For the allotment of category-IV plots, the I.B.A. sent an altogether different list of lawyers along with its recommendations to F.G.E.H.F. The names of the 14 lawyers/applicants who had applied to F.G.E.H.F. within the stipulated deadline for the allotment of category-IV plots was brushed aside by the I.B.A. This the I.B.A. could not do. The I.B.A. could not recommend names of those lawyers for allotment of plots who had not even applied to F.G.E.H.F. within the stipulated deadline for allotment of category-IV plots. Since the total number of the category-IV plots available were 14 and since only 14 lawyers/applicants (nine out of whom are the writ petitioners) had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of category-IV plots, Writ Petition No.2133/2005 is allowed and F.G.E.H.F. is directed to issue allotment letters for category-IV plots to the 14 applicants, whose names are listed in **"Schedule-C"** hereto.

Writ Petition No.2516/2005, titled "Muhammad Azam Khan Sultanpuri Vs. F.G.E.H.F. etc."

40. Writ petition No.2516/2005 was filed on 31.08.2005. The petitioner in the said writ petition had prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to issue an allotment letter for a category-IV plot. The petitioner was enrolled as an Advocate in 1977. Since the petitioner is also one of the 14 applicants who had applied for allotment of a category-IV plot, and since there were only 14 category-IV plots available for allotment to lawyers/applicants, the petitioner's case is on the same footing as the petitioners' in Writ Petition No.2133/2005. Therefore, writ petition No.2516/2005 is also allowed and F.G.E.H.F. is directed to allot a category-IV plot in Phase-IV of its Housing Scheme to the petitioner. Paragraph No.33 of this judgment contains additional reasons for allowing writ petitions No.2133/2005 and No.2516/2005.

Writ Petition No.2816/2005, titled "Javed Ullah Khan etc. Vs. F.G.E.H.F. etc."

41. Writ petition No.2816/2005 was filed on 06.10.2005. The four petitioners in the said writ petition had prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to issue allotment letters in their favour. The petitioners are members of the I.B.A., and claim to have applied for the allotment of category-V plots, and deposited an amount of Rs.26,000/- each with F.G.E.H.F. In the said writ petition, it was *inter-alia* pleaded that for the 10 category-V plots, there were only four applicants i.e. the petitioners; that since there were 10 available category-V plots, and only four applicants, for allotment of the plots in said category, F.G.E.H.F. ought to have issued allotment letters in their favour; that there was no reason for F.G.E.H.F. to have referred the matter regarding the allotment of plots to the I.B.A.; and that the I.B.A. recommended to F.G.E.H.F. that category-V plots should be awarded to 10 members of the I.B.A. (who had not even applied for the allotment of plots within the deadline stipulated by F.G.E.H.F.), by excluding the petitioners' names altogether.

42. We are of the view that since only four applicants (i.e. the petitioners in Writ Petition No. 2816/2005) had applied to F.G.E.H.F. within the stipulated deadline for allotment of category-V plots, and that since there were 10 category-V plots available for allotment to the members of the I.B.A. in Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F.'s Hosing Scheme, there is no impediment before F.G.E.H.F. to issue allotment letters in favour of the said four petitioners. It is not denied that the said petitioners were members of the I.B.A., and were eligible for allotment of plots in the said Housing Scheme. The list of lawyers submitted by the I.B.A. to the F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of plots in category-V cannot take precedence over the petitioners. The list of lawyers/applicants forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A. along with the letter dated 22.03.2005, shows that only the four writ petitioners in the said writ petition had applied for allotment of category-V plots. Writ Petition No.2816/2005 is allowed and F.G.E.H.F. is directed to issue allotment letters for category-V plots to the four petitioners in the said writ petition. The names of the writ petitioners/applicants who are to be allotted category-V plots by F.G.E.H.F. is set out in **"Schedule-D"** hereto. Paragraph No.34 of this judgment contains additional reasons for allowing writ petition No.2816/2005.

Writ Petition No.202/2006, titled "Syed Zafar Ali Shah Vs. Ministry of Housing & Works etc."

43. Writ petition No.202/2006 was filed on 02.02.2006. The petitioner in the said writ petition had prayed for *inter-alia* a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to allot a category-I plot in Sector G-14, Islamabad, to the petitioner. The petitioner also prayed that I.B.A.'s recommendation to allot a category-I plot to Chaudhary Ghazanfar Ali (respondent No.5 in the said writ petition) be declared as null and void. In the said writ petition, it is *inter-alia* pleaded that the petitioner is the senior most member of the I.B.A. (in terms of age as well as seniority in the legal profession), and is also a practicing Advocate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court; that the petitioner, in response to the advertisement issued by F.G.E.H.F., applied for the allotment of a category-I plot, and

deposited a sum of Rs.1,26,000/- along with his application; that the petitioner's name is at Serial No.7 in the list prepared by F.G.E.H.F. of the lawyers/applicants who had applied for category-I plots; that the said list was prepared on the basis of seniority in terms of age; that after the said list was forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A., the latter unlawfully excluded the petitioner's name, and recommended the names of two other members of the I.B.A. for allotment of a category-I plots; that one of the two such member was Chaudhary Ghazanfar Ali, who had subsequently passed away; that Chaudhary Ghazanfar Ali had not even applied for allotment of a category-I plot; and that since Chaudhary Ghazafar Ali had passed away on 12.09.2007, and his legal heirs had not sought the allotment of a category-I plot, there is no impediment before F.G.E.H.F. in allotting a category-I plot to the petitioner.

44. It is an admitted position that the petitioner in writ petition No.202/2006 is a member of the I.B.A. It is also not disputed that he had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of category-I plot within the stipulated deadline. In the list of lawyers who applied to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of category-I plots within the stipulated deadline, the petitioner's name finds mention at Serial No.7. This list was compiled by F.G.E.H.F. and forwarded to the I.B.A. along with the letter dated 22.03.2005. Since the number of available category-I plots are less than the total number of applicants for such plots (inasmuch as there are only two category-I plots available, whereas 46 applicants had applied for such plots), we refer the petitioner's case to the Ministry of Law to determine a criteria for selecting 2 lawyers/applicants amongst the 46 applicants, and make recommendations to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of the 2 category-I plots.

Writ Petition No.961/2006, titled "Muhammad Saleem Vs F.G.E.H.F. etc."

45. Writ petition No.961/2006 was filed on 13.04.2006. The petitioner in the said writ petition had prayed for *inter-alia* a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to allot a category-II plot in Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F.'s Housing Scheme to the petitioner. The petitioner

has also prayed that the deviation by F.G.E.H.F. and the I.B.A. from the terms and conditions of the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F., and I.B.A. be declared as void and *coram-non-judice*. In the said writ petition, it is *inter-alia* pleaded that the petitioner was enrolled as a Pleader in District Rawalpindi on 04.01.1961, as an Advocate of the High Court on 05.11.1963, and as an Advocate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 22.05.1998; that the petitioner is a member of the I.B.A.; that the petitioner applied to F.G.E.H.F. for an allotment of a category-II plot, and deposited a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- along with his application; that the petitioner's name is at Serial No.3 in the list prepared by F.G.E.H.F. of the lawyers/applicants, who had applied for category-II plots; that the said list was prepared on the basis of seniority in terms of age; that after the said list was forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A., the latter unlawfully excluded the petitioner's name, and recommended the names of nine other members of the I.B.A. for allotment of a category-II plots; that as per the list prepared by F.G.E.H.F., there were total of 69 applicants/lawyers, who had applied for category-II plots; that the I.B.A. could not have been given an authority to select lawyers for allotment of category-II plots; and that the terms and conditions contained in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. could not have been amended by including the names of lawyers, who had not even applied for plots within the deadline stipulated by F.G.E.H.F.

46. It is an admitted position that the petitioner in writ petition No.961/2006 is a member of the I.B.A. It is also not disputed that he had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of category-II plot within the stipulated deadline, and had deposited the requisite amount. In the list of lawyers who had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of category-II plots within the stipulated deadline, the petitioner's name finds mention at Serial No.3. This list was compiled by F.G.E.H.F. and forwarded to the I.B.A. along with the letter dated 22.03.2005. Since the number of available category-II plots are less than the total number of applicants for such plots (inasmuch as there are only nine category-II plots available,

whereas 69 applicants had applied for such plots), we refer the petitioner's case to the Ministry of Law to determine a criteria for selecting 9 lawyers/applicants amongst the 69 applicants, and make recommendations to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of the 9 category-II plots.

Writ Petition No.1139/2006, titled "Pirzada Shaukat Farid, Advocate Vs F.G.E.H.F. etc."

47. Writ petition No.1139/2006 was filed on 04.05.2006. The petitioner in the said writ petition had prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to issue an allotment letter for a category-II plot in Phase-IV of F.G.E.H.F.'s Housing Scheme to the petitioner in accordance with the terms and conditions of the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. In the said writ petition, it was *inter-alia* pleaded that the petitioner was enrolled as Advocate in 1988 and became a member of the I.B.A. in 2002; that the petitioner applied to F.G.E.H.F. for an allotment of a category-II plot, and deposited a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- along with his application; that the petitioner's name is at Serial No.22 in the list prepared by F.G.E.H.F. of the lawyers/applicants, who had applied for category-II plots; that the said list was prepared on the basis of seniority in terms of age; that after the said list was forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A., the latter unlawfully excluded the petitioner's name, and recommended the names of nine other members of the I.B.A. for allotment of a category-II plots; that as per the list prepared by F.G.E.H.F., there were a total of 69 applicants/lawyers who had applied for category-II plots; that the I.B.A. could not have been given an authority to select lawyers for allotment of category-II plots; and that the terms and conditions contained in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. could not have been amended by including the names of lawyers who had not even applied for plots within the deadline stipulated by F.G.E.H.F.

48. It is an admitted position that the petitioner in writ petition No.1139/2006 is a member of the I.B.A. It is also not disputed that he had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of category-II plot within the stipulated deadline. In the list of lawyers who applied

to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of category-II plots within the stipulated deadline, the petitioner's name finds mention at Serial No.22. This list was compiled by F.G.E.H.F. and forwarded to the I.B.A. along with the letter dated 22.03.2005. Since the number of available category-II plots are less than the total number of applicants for such plots (inasmuch as there are only nine category-II plots available, whereas 69 applicants had applied for such plots), we refer the petitioner's case to the Ministry of Law to determine a criteria for selecting 9 lawyers/applicants amongst the 69 applicants, and make recommendations to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of the 9 category-II plots.

Writ Petition No.2140/2009, titled "Raja Muhammad Anwar-ul-Haq, Advocate Vs Ministry of Housing and Works etc."

49. Writ petition No.2140/2009 was filed on 27.03.2009. The petitioner in the said writ petition had prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to consider the petitioner for allotment of a category-II plot and to receive the requisite amount from the petitioner. The petitioner had also prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. not to adopt a policy of pick and choose in allotting plots. In the said writ petition, it was *inter-alia* pleaded that the petitioner has been a member of the I.B.A. since 1992; that the petitioner applied to F.G.E.H.F. for an allotment of a category-II plot, and deposited the requisite amount in the National Bank of Pakistan; that the petitioner's name is at Serial No.24 in the list prepared by F.G.E.H.F. of the lawyers/applicants, who had applied for category-II plots; that the said list was prepared on the basis of seniority in terms of age; that after the said list was forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A., the latter unlawfully excluded the petitioner's name, and recommended the names of nine other members of the I.B.A. for allotment of a category-II plots; that as per the list prepared by F.G.E.H.F., there were total of 69 applicants/lawyers who had applied for category-II plots; that the I.B.A. could not have been given an authority to select lawyers for allotment of category-II plots; and that the terms and conditions contained in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. could not have been amended by including the names of lawyers who

had not even applied for plots within the deadline stipulated by F.G.E.H.F.

50. It is an admitted position that the petitioner in writ petition No.2140/2009 is a member of the I.B.A. It is also not disputed that he had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of category-II plot within the stipulated deadline. In the list of lawyers forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A., the petitioner's name appears at serial No.24, on the basis of age-wise seniority. Since the number of available category-II plots are less than the total number of applicants for such plots (inasmuch as there are only nine category-II plots available, whereas 69 applicants had applied for such plots), we refer the petitioner's case to the Ministry of Law to determine a criteria for selecting 9 lawyers/applicants amongst the 69 applicants, and make recommendations to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of the 9 category-II plots.

Writ Petition No.3059/2005, titled "Chaudhary Mumtaz Ali Vs. F.G.E.H.F. etc."

51. Writ petition No.3059/2005 was filed on 31.10.2005. The petitioner in the said writ petition prayed for a direction to F.G.E.H.F. to issue an allotment letter in the petitioner's favour in accordance with the terms and conditions of the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F. The petitioner was enrolled as an Advocate of the West Pakistan High Court after he gained an L.L.B. degree in the year 1963. In paragrah-3 of the said writ petition, it had been pleaded that the petitioner was a member of the I.B.A. and had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for a category-III plot. Furthermore, it was pleaded that the petitioner had deposited an amount of Rs.65,000/- along with his application; that there were a total of 7 available plots in category-III, and F.G.E.H.F. had received 22 applications from Advocates for the allotment of plots in the said category; that F.G.E.H.F. had placed the petitioner's name at Serial No.3 in the list prepared on the basis of age-wise seniority; that the I.B.A. had excluded the petitioner's name from the seniority list submitted by the I.B.A. to F.G.E.H.F.; that I.B.A. had no authority to devise a criteria for allotment of plots to its

members; and that the I.B.A. could not disregard the eligibility criteria set out in the brochure issued by F.G.E.H.F.

52. It is not disputed that the petitioner in writ petition No.3059/2005 is a member of the I.B.A. It is also not disputed that he had applied to F.G.E.H.F. for allotment of category-III plot within the stipulated deadline. In the list of lawyers forwarded by F.G.E.H.F. to the I.B.A., the petitioner's name appears at serial No.3, on the basis of age-wise seniority. Since the number of available category-III plots are less than the total number of applicants for such plots (inasmuch as there are only seven category-III plots available, whereas 22 applicants had applied for such plots), we refer the petitioner's case to the Ministry of Law to determine a criteria for selecting 7 lawyers/applicants amongst the 22 applicants, and make recommendations to F.G.E.H.F. for the allotment of the 7 category-III plots.

53. The writ petitions listed in **"Schedule-A"** hereto are disposed of in the above terms. There shall be no order as to costs.

(AAMER FAROOQ)
JUDGE

(MIANGUL HASSAN AURANGZEB)
JUDGE

ANNOUNCED IN AN OPEN COURT ON _____/2017

(JUDGE) **(JUDGE)**

Ahtesham

Uploaded By: Zulqarnain Shah

"SCHEDULE-A"

1. W.P.No.2133/2005 (Abdul Ghaffar Khan Lodhi and others Vs. Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and others).
2. W.P.No.2516/2005 (Muhammad Azam Khan Sultanpuri Vs. Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and others).
3. W.P.No.2816/2005 (Javed Ullah Khan and others Vs. Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and others).
4. W.P.No.202/2006 (Syed Zafar Ali Shah Vs. Ministry of Housing and Works through its Secretary and others).
5. W.P.No.961/2006 (Muhammad Saleem Advocate Vs. Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and another).
6. W.P.No.3059/2005 (Chaudhary Mumtaz Ali Advocate Vs. Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and others).
7. W.P.No.3366/2005 (Abdul Ghani Channa Vs. Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and others).
8. W.P.No.1139/2006 (Pirzada Shaukat Farid Advocate Vs. Federal Government Employees Housing Foundation and another).
9. W.P.No.2140/2009 (Raja Muhammad Anwar Ul Haq Advocate Vs. Ministry of Housing and Works and others).

"SCHEDULE-B"

CATEGORY-I	
S.No.	**Name**
1.	Mr. Syed Asghar Hussain Sabazwari
2.	Ch. Ghazanfar Ali
CATEGORY-II	
1.	Malik Meherban Khan
2.	Ch. Sultan Mehmood
3.	Syed Nayyar Hussain Bukhari
4.	Qazi Rafi ud Din Babar
5.	Mr. Muhammad Abbas
6.	Mr. Munir Ellahi Qureshi
7.	Mirza Musharaf Ali Jami
8.	Mr. Muhammad Mahboob Alam
9.	Mr. Asghar Ali Khan
CATEGORY-III	
1.	Malik Muhammad Tariq Tanoli
2.	Mr. Muhammad Anwar Baig
3.	Mr. Muhammad Shujaat Raja
4.	Mr. Ishtiaq Hussain
5.	Sardar Muhammad Azeem
6.	Mr. Muhammad Izzat Khan
7.	Mr. Muhammad Aslam Khaki
CATEGORY-IV	

1.	Syed Zafar Ali Shah (Out of 10%)
2.	Syed Amber Tajwer
3.	Miss Rubina Saeed
4.	Sardar Javed Khan
5.	Mr. Saleem Raza
6.	Mr. Shah Muhammad Abdul Wahab
7.	Mr. Riaz Ahmed
8.	Mr. Muhammad Ishtiaq Ahmad
9.	Mr. Imtiaz ul Islam
10.	Mr. Mujataba Haider Sherizi
11.	Mr. Gull Hussain
12.	Mr. Muhammad Qasim Khan Niazi
13.	Mr. Fayyaz Ahmad Khan Noorazi
14.	Mr. Zulfiqar Ameen Abbasi
CATEGORY-V	
1.	Mr. Muhammad Arbab Abbasi (Out of 10%)
2.	Mr. Muhammad Amjad Iqbal
3.	Mr. Muhammad Shafqat Khan
4.	Mr. Ishfaq Ali Raja
5.	Mr. Matee ur Rehman
6.	Mr. Ghulam Javed
7.	Mr. Ahmad Nawaz Chaudhry
8.	Mr. Tariq Khashnood Qureshi
9.	Mr. Mumtaz Ahmad
10.	Mr. Ghulam Mustafa

"SCHEDULE-C"

S.No.	Name
1.	Mr. Abdul Ghaffar Khan Lodhi
2.	Mr. Muhammad Azam Khan
3.	Mr. Sarfaraz Ali Khan
4.	Mr. Mir Afzal
5.	Mr. Muhammad Qaboor Khattak
6.	Mr. Arif Mehmood
7.	Raja Qamar-uz-Zaman
8.	Mr. Naeem Yar Gondal
9.	Mr. Rizwan Akhtar Awan
10.	Mr. Rifaqat Islam Awan
11.	Mr. Faiz Ahmad Anjum Jandran
12.	Mrs. Sitwat Jahangir Ahmed Mir
13.	Mr. Muhammad Ali
14.	Miss Arifa Chanda

"SCHEDULE-D"

S.No.	Name
1.	Mr. Javedullah Khan
2.	Rao Kamran Shaukat
3.	Mr. Naveed Hayat Malik
4.	Mr. Tanveer Hussain Mirza

Uploaded By: Zulqarnain Shah