

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

Before:-

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

**Civil Appeal No. 41/2016
in
CPLA No. 39/2016.**

Khalid Mehmood & others

Petitioners.

Versus

Provincial Govt. & others

Respondents.

PRESENT:-

1. Mr. Malik Shafqat Wali senior Advocate alongwith Mr. Ali Nazar Khan Advocate-on-Record for the petitioners.
2. The Advocate General Gilgit-Baltistan on behalf of the respondents.

DATE OF HEARING: - 03.10.2017.

JUDGMENT.

Dr. Rana Muhammad Shamim, CJ..... This appeal has been directed against the impugned order dated 10.12.2015 passed by the learned Chief Court whereby the Writ Petition No. 109/2011 filed by the petitioners was dismissed being meritless, hence, this petition for leave to appeal. This court vide order dated 10.06.2016 granted leave to appeal and the case is heard today.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the petitioners have been working as contingent paid staff against various posts at the strength of Governor Gilgit-Baltistan since 2010. The petitioners contended that they are working against the regular posts and they seek for the conversion of their services into regular footing.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are entitled to be regularized against the posts held by them keeping in view their satisfactory long services as contingent employees in line to the Office Memorandum dated 12.08.2011 issued by the Cabinet Secretariat Establishment Division Islamabad. He also submits that at the time of their contingent appointment, the petitioners were assured by the respondents to adjust them on regular basis as soon as the regular posts are sanctioned. Per learned counsel, the learned Chief Court failed to appreciate the facts of the case while passing the impugned order, hence, the same is not sustainable. He prays that the impugned order may graciously be set aside by accepting this appeal.

4. On the other hand, the learned Advocate General appearing on behalf of the respondents supports the impugned order passed by the learned Chief Court. He contends that the petitioners are working purely on contingent basis and there is no policy to regularize the contingent services into regular service. Per learned Advocate General, the petitioners have no vested right to claim for conversion of their posts into regular service. He submits that the Writ Petition filed by the petitioners in the learned Chief Court was not maintainable and meritless, the same has rightly been dismissed in circumstances. He prays that the impugned order may pleased be by upheld.

5. We have heard the learned counsels for the respective parties at length, perused the material on record and gone through

the impugned order passed by the learned Chief Court. Since the learned counsel for the petitioners could not point out any infirmity in the impugned order, hence, no interference into it is warranted by this court.

6. In view of the above discussions, we dismiss this appeal by upholding the impugned order passed the learned Chief Court.

7. The appeal is dismissed in above terms.

Chief Judge.

Judge.