



FEDERAL OMBUDSMAN

Informal Resolution of Disputes (IRD)

Article 33 of the President's Order No. 1 of 1983

**Establishment of the Office of Wafaqi Mohtasib (Ombudsman) Order
1983**

&

**Federal Ombudsmen Institutional Reforms Act 2013 –
Act No. XIV of 2013**

**Wafaqi Mohtasib Secretariat,
36 Constitution Avenue G-5/2,
Islamabad.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Sl. No. | Topic | Page Number |
|----------------|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Introduction | 3 |
| 2. | Article 33 of the President's Order No. 1 of 1983 | 3 |
| 3. | Scope of Work | 4 |
| 4. | Procedure | 5 |
| 5. | Annexures: | |
| | Annex-I Concept Paper | 8 |
| | Annex-II <i>Proforma</i> for Reporting the Case to WMS | 13 |
| | Annex-III Selected Stories of IRD Presented by: | 14 |
| | i. Mr. Muhammad Saqib Khan, Consultant/Registrar WMS, Islamabad. | 15 |
| | ii. Dr. Muhammad Zahid, Investigation Officer, WMS Bahawalpur. | 18 |
| | iii. Mr. Ghulam Sarwar Brohi, Associate Advisor/Regional Head WMS Quetta | 20 |
| | iv. Mr. Shahzada Alauddin, Investigation Officer, WMS Kharan. | 21 |

1. Introduction

The concept of Informal Resolution of Disputes (IRD) is akin to the centuries old Jirga / Panchayat systems where local elders resolved complaints of locals through the force of moral character, social influence and conventional wisdom. IRD offers inexpensive, rather free of any cost, expeditious and convenient forum for resolving disputes. Therefore, is likely to be 'preferred mode' especially for lower strata of society, compared to the formal judicial system which is expensive and involves lengthy legal processes. It is in a way out of court settlement of dispute.

Article 33 of PO 1 of 1983 provides for resolution of disputes of the citizens through mediation and conciliation without the necessity of docketing any complaint or issuing any official notices. This mechanism involves resolution rather than decision whereby parties are persuaded to come to an understanding/agreement.

In March 2022, it was decided by the Wafaqi Mohtasib to further broaden the scope of activities of his office by invoking Article 33 for the benefit of common citizen of Pakistan. The step / decision was in compliance with the advice of the Honorable President of Pakistan to the Wafaqi Mohtasib to expand the scope of activities of the latter.

Accordingly, on the directions of the Wafaqi Mohtasib, a committee of senior officers of WMS prepared modalities and procedure for implementation of IRD. These were approved, after thorough deliberations, by the Wafaqi Mohtasib. The scheme was to be implemented in 2 phases i.e. based on the success of the pilot (1st) phase, the scheme was to move in 2nd phase.

The Pilot Project has been launched at the Head Office Islamabad and the Regional Offices at Karachi, Lahore, Peshawar, Quetta, Multan, Bahawalpur, Abbottabad and D.I. Khan.

2. The Article 33

“Informal Resolution of Disputes.— (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Order, the Mohtasib and a member of the staff shall have the authority to informally conciliate, amicably resolve, stipulate, settle or ameliorate any grievance without written memorandum and

without the necessity of docketing any complaint or issuing any official notice.

(2) The Mohtasib may appoint for purposes of liaison counsellors, whether honorary or otherwise, at local levels on such terms and conditions as the Mohtasib may deem proper.”

3. Scope of Work

First/Pilot Phase

- a. Small contractual claims up to the value of Rs. 50,000/-
- b. Disputes based on negotiable instruments valued up to Rs. 50,000/-
- c. Any dispute where the parties agree for the resolution of their dispute through Wafaqi Mohtasib Centre for Informal Resolution of Disputes (WMCIRD).
- d. Complaints relating to delay in processing the payment of pension and other retirement benefits to the retired employees and the families of deceased employees, of the Defence Forces.
- e. Delay in reimbursement of medical claims of employees of federal agencies.
- f. Delay or refusal in grant of house subsidy or hiring facility to the ministerial staff of federal agencies.

Second Phase

Based on the success proportion of the first phase, the second phase shall be implemented by:

- a. Expanding the scope of jurisdiction whereby the amount of claims and negotiable instruments up to the value of Rs.50,000/- will be increased to Rs.100,000/- and complaints regarding non-payment of rent of houses/vehicles requisitioned by the Defence Forces.
- b. Establishing offices at remote areas;
- c. Involving the members of the civil society/elders of the locality in the process of mediation and conciliation.
- d. Reporting important cases to the press without compromising on the privacy of the contending parties.

- e. General invitation to public for availing the services of WMCIRD;
- f. Members of the civil society especially retired experienced civil servants can be engaged for the purpose as Counsellors under Article 33(2) of the Order.
- g. The High Courts can also be requested to enlist the Wafaqi Mohtasib Centre for Informal Resolution of Disputes (WMCIRD) as the institution of ADR for reference of matters from the Courts under the ADR Laws.

4. Procedure to be Followed in IRD Cases

The procedure of handling the IRD cases will be as follows:

- a. The Registrars will apply their mind at the time of preliminary examination of the complaints as to whether the matter (which may be otherwise not fit for admission/investigation) can be taken up for informal resolution under 3rd proviso to Regulation No. 5(2) of the Wafaqi Mohtasib (Investigation and Disposal of Complaints) Regulations 2013 read with the parameters laid down in the Concept Paper of IRD (***Annex-I***) for taking up types of cases for informal resolution.
- b. One or more officers may be designated at the Head Office Islamabad as well as at the Regional Offices for informal resolution of disputes. The Registrar concerned shall forward the case to the designated officer for resolution.
- c. As the work relating to IRD expands, dedicated officers for IRD work will be appointed, thereby relieving other IOs in order to avoid interruption of the routine investigation work.
- d. The IRD cases should be undertaken with the consent of all parties; should strictly be on the basis of persuasion, mediation and reconciliation; and without any legal obligation.
- e. More emphasis should be on the outcome rather than process and procedures.
- f. Separate hearings may be held with each party where necessary, before holding joint hearings.
- g. Cases related to land disputes may be avoided.
- h. Cases related to family disputes such as divorce, *khula* and controversial-wills etc., may also be avoided.

- i. The IOs while dealing with IRD cases should strive to remain polite but firm in their dealing with the parties.
- j. Efforts should be made to resolve the issues through telephonic conversations and persuasions.
- k. The cases that are within the jurisdiction of Wafaqi Mohtasib can also be taken under IRD, if the subject matter brooks no delay; and needs to be resolved instantly.
- l. The designated officer shall examine the file and approach the private respondent, preferably on phone, to know whether he is willing for the informal resolution of the dispute. If he/she concedes, the IO may fix a date, time and venue as per convenience of the parties for conciliation or mediation.
- m. If the private respondent does not agree to informal resolution, the designated IO may require the complainant to get the consent from the respondent. If the complainant fails to get the consent, the IO may stop further action on the complaint and consign the case file to the record.
- n. If the respondent is an Agency, the investigating officer may write a polite letter to the focal person or the officer in charge of the branch to which the complaint relates, for favourable action or comments.
- o. If the Agency contests the claim, the IO may fix a date for hearing of the case and may try to persuade the representative of the Agency and the complainant for settlement or resolution of the dispute.
- p. If the matter is resolved, the terms of settlement may be reduced into writing with signature of the parties.
- q. The IO concerned should write a letter of thanks to the Agency concerned for resolving the case expeditiously.
- r. If the issue cannot be resolved, proceedings may be stopped and file may be consigned to record under intimation to the parties concerned.
- s. A report, on completion of the case, will be submitted to the Coordination Wing WMS as per *poforma* already circulated (**Annex-II**).
- t. On an average 10-15 cases may be taken up under IRD scheme by an IO, and his normal work may not be allowed to suffer.

- u. It is important that both parties enjoy complete trust in the ability of the WMS IO to negotiate the settlement as well as ensure complete secrecy and confidentiality of the information made available by the parties.
- v. Although no precise timelines can be fixed for various stages of the IRD process, the IO may determine notional timelines in the beginning of every case in order to ensure optimum time management.
- w. Regional Heads will ensure that the IRD mechanism in no way is exploited by influential individuals/parties or used as a coercive enforcement tool that could impede the access to justice.**

**CONCEPT PAPER ON INFORMAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER ARTICLE
33 OF ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF WAFAQI MOHTASIB
(OMBUDSMAN) ORDER 1983**

Introduction:

Before bringing Informal Resolution of Dispute system into light, it is necessary to take on alternative dispute resolution. The term “alternative dispute resolution” or “ADR” is often used to describe a wide variety of dispute resolution mechanisms that are short of, or alternative to, full-scale court processes. The term can refer to everything from facilitated settlement negotiations in which disputants are encouraged to negotiate directly with each other prior to some other legal process, to arbitration systems or mini-trials that look and feel very much like a courtroom process. Processes designed to manage community tension or facilitate community development issues can also be included within the rubric of ADR. ADR systems may be generally categorized as negotiation, conciliation/mediation, or arbitration systems.

Negotiation systems create a structure to encourage and facilitate direct negotiation between parties to a dispute, without the intervention of a third party, Mediation and conciliation systems are very similar in that they interject a third party between the disputants, either to mediate a specific dispute or to reconcile their relationship. Mediators and conciliators may simply facilitate communication, or may help direct and structure a settlement, but they do not have the authority to decide or rule on a settlement. Arbitration systems authorize a third party to decide how a dispute should be resolved.

It is important to distinguish between binding and non-binding forms of ADR. Negotiation, mediation, and conciliation programs are non-binding, and depend on the willingness of the parties to reach a voluntary agreement. Arbitration programs may be either binding or non-binding. Binding arbitration produces a third party decision that the disputants must follow even if they disagree with the result, much like a judicial decision. Non-binding arbitration produces a third party decision that the parties may reject.

It is also important to distinguish between mandatory processes and voluntary processes. Some judicial systems require litigants to negotiate, conciliate, mediate, or arbitrate prior to court action. ADR processes may also be required as part of a prior contractual agreement between parties. In voluntary processes, submission of a dispute to an ADR process depends entirely on the will of the parties.

Alternate Dispute Resolution System in Pakistan

Pakistan is a federal state, wherein provinces have their own laws/rules on all the issues after observing constitutional provisions except currency, foreign policy and defense. All the provinces have their own judicial system as well as Alternate Dispute Resolution Mechanism. The details of some laws on the impugned topic are as under:

- i. Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, 2017 (Federal).
- ii. The Punjab Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, 2019.
- iii. The Code of Civil Procedure (Sindh Amendment) Act, 2018.
- iv. The KPK Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, 2020.
- v. Arbitration Act, 1940.
- vi. Conciliation Courts Ordinance, 1961.
- vii. The Small Claims and Minor Offences Courts Ordinance, 2002.

As Pakistan is not a unitary state and in the presence of above laws and provincial as well as judicial jurisdiction i.e. territorial jurisdiction, pecuniary jurisdiction and administrative jurisdiction, the invoking of *Article 33 of Order ibid* for informal resolution of disputes should be cautious and prudent. However, the invoking of above provision in IDR is possible in two ways:

1. All the complaints against the Federal Government Agencies, the subject-matters which are not in the purview/jurisdiction of WMS i.e. sub-judice matters, service matters etc., may be mediated, conciliated or arbitrated by the WMS (Head Office & Regional Offices) with the consent of both the parties after observing due procedure.
2. All the Small Contractual Disputes to the limitation of Rs. 100,000/-, Dispute regarding Negotiable instruments valued upto Rs. 100,000/-, Disputes to restrain waste and remove nuisance and any other Dispute agreed by the parties to be settled with the help of WMS-CIDR may be settled after signing mutual agreement by parties through mediation, conciliation and arbitration of CIDR.

Forms of IDR (Informal Dispute Resolution) offered to the Parties through WMCIDR (Wafaqi Mohtasib Centre for Informal Dispute Resolution)

WMCIDR will conduct IDR by accepting the complaint and forwarding it to opposing party. The same would be resolved through conciliation, mediation and Arbitration.

1. CONCILIATION:

After receiving complaint, the representative of WMCIDR will play a role as conciliator among the parties and meet with the parties, often separately, to discuss and negotiate a complaint informally. The conciliator may make suggestions as the parties consider how to resolve a dispute. The parties will find their own resolution to a dispute, with the assistance of the conciliator. After reaching at a point of resolution to dispute, both the parties will sign an agreement for conciliation. The agreement is not in conflict with law or the governing documents of the common interest development or association.

2. MEDIATION:

“Mediation is the most common method presently used for resolving disputes. Mediation offers the parties a safe forum for reviewing options and enables the parties to develop their own settlement terms by a mutual agreement. After receiving complaint, the representative of WMCIDR will play a role as mediator among the parties and aid the parties in reaching agreement on how to resolve a dispute. To request mediation through the WMCIDR, relevant party/parties has/have to submit Contract/Complaint Form and the Agreement to Mediate. Mediation conferences are informal proceedings. That means that the strict legal rules of evidence do not apply in mediation. This allows for an unrestricted discussion of issues and misunderstandings. If the parties reach a settlement, the mediator puts the settlement agreement in writing and all the parties and the mediator sign it. The agreement describes both the settlement of issues and the future responsibilities of each party. Once signed the agreement is a binding contract, which is enforceable by courts.

3. ARBITRATION:

“Arbitration” is a voluntary, confidential process in which a neutral “arbitrator” hears both sides of a controversy and decides all aspects of the case based on the

facts and the law just like a judge without judicial trial. The parties may agree in writing that the decision will be binding, and enforceable. Arbitration through WMCIDR will be voluntary. The parties must be agreed for arbitration, and if they do, they must be present for the arbitration hearing. However, sometimes an agreement, made before there is a dispute, requires the parties to arbitrate instead of filing a lawsuit.

The process of Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration involves the following:

- i. The complaining party fills out a Contract/Complaint form requesting for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration and files it with the WMCIDR, and delivers copy to the responding party with a copy of an Agreement to Conciliate/Mediate/Arbitrate.
- ii. The Services of WMCIDR for the whole process will be free of cost.
- iii. The parties must agree for conciliation/mediation/arbitration.
- iv. The parties may agree whether the arbitration will be binding or non-binding.
- v. On the request of both the parties, another person may also be involved (with his consent) as arbitrator.
- vi. WMCIDR will specify a date and time for the arbitration that is convenient for both parties.
- vii. 15 days before the Mediation/Arbitration date the complaining party will submit all pertinent records needed for decision of the case to WMCIDR and the responding party.
- viii. On the day and time of the Conciliation/Mediation/Arbitration the parties will attend hearing at WMCIDR.
- ix. Both the parties would be provided opportunity of hearing and they may be advised by WMCIDR to submit their evidences/proofs etc.
- x. After completion of due procedure, the complaint / application / agreements of conciliation / mediation / arbitration will be disposed of in the following manners:
 - a. At the end of successful conciliation process, all the parties must put any agreement resolving the dispute in writing and sign it.
 - b. During mediation when the parties reach an agreement, WMCIDR will assist by reducing the agreement to writing. WMCIDR may follow up with each party to see that each side is honoring the agreement, if that is necessary.

- c. WMCIDR as an arbitrator may make a decision on the spot or may make a decision within seven days and deliver a written decision to the parties within that time.

**WAFaqI MOHTASIB SECRETARIAT
INFORMAL RESOLUTION OF DISPUTE (IRD)
UNDER ARTICLE 33 OF P.O. NO. 1 OF 1983**

| | |
|--|---|
| Complaint No. | |
| Date of Registration | |
| Name, CNIC No. & address of the complainant | |
| Name, CNIC No. & address of the other Party | |
| _____ Signatures of the Filing Party | _____ Signatures of the Responding Party |
| Number & Dates of Hearing | |

SETTLEMENT

Brief nature of the dispute and position of the contending parties:

Terms of settlement as negotiated by the Investigating Officer

NAME AND SIGNATURE OF THE INVESTIGATING OFFICER OF WMS

SELECTED STORIES OF IRD PRESENTATIONS

IRD SELECTED STORIES PRESENTED BY MR. MUHAMMAD SAQIB KHAN,
CONSULTANT / REGISTRAR, WMS, ISLAMABAD

Although Article 33 of P.O. No. 1 of 1983 has been seldom operative in the past by different Ombudsman, however, the present Hon'ble Wafaqi Mohtasib has fully concentrated on exercising this Article for speedy and informal resolution of complaints. Under his direction, several complaints have been disposed of under IRD and many are under process at WMS Head Office and Regional Offices. Some of latest IRD cases disposed of at WMS Head Office are follows:-

1. Dr. Nighat Gillani Versus HBL and Jubilee Life insurance company.

Grievance: The complainant invested Rs. 3 million in the HBL against which HBL paid her profit @ 11% Next year when she contacted the Bank Authorities for profit, she was informed that her amount has been invested into Jubilee Life Insurance Company. Later, it transpired that her amount was invested fraudulently by the Lady Bank Officer into Jubilee Life Insurance Company against which she had received Rs. 4 lacs as commission. She agitated and asked to refund her amount but HBL informed that she may get back her amount after deduction of 85% of the total amount. After failing to get her money she filed a complaint before Insurance Mohtasib but did not get relief.

IRD process: The HBL, FIA, SECP and State Bank of Pakistan were engaged in the matter. During the IRD process it revealed that jubilee Insurance Company violated basic insurance rules.

Remedy: The Jubilee Insurance Company refunded Rs. 3 million to the complainant.

Remarks: The IRD case was disposed off. The complainant thanked the Honorable Wafaqi Mohtasib for kind intervention.

2. Ms. Zenia Akram & 49 Others Versus Management of Al-Safa Heights-II (Private to Private)

Grievance: Non- maintenance of residential building despite claiming maintenance charges from the residents (150 families).

IRD Process: Since it was a private matter and in view of the gravity of the situation it was decided to take cognizance of the matter under Article 33 of the P.O 1 of 1983. Both parties were asked to appear at one stage. CDA was also involved and the site was visited twice in the presence of management of the Al-Safa Heights and the complainant.

Remedy: Two elevators repaired and water supply restored. Monitoring Committee formed for maintenance of building.

Remarks: IRD complaint was disposed of and the complainant sent letter of thanks to the Honorable Wafaqi Mohtasib.

3. Ms. Sana Masih Versus Islamabad Police

Grievance: Mobile phone of the complainant was stolen but neither phone recovered nor the accused arrested by the police in spite of the fact the FIR was lodged.

IRD process: Keeping in view inordinate delay of taking action by the police, cognizance of the matter was taken under Article 33 of the P.O 1 of 1983. Both parties were asked to appear. The representatives of Islamabad Police pledged to resolve the issue within a week.

Remedy: The stolen mobile phone was recovered and the accused arrested.

Remarks: the IRD complaint was disposed of. The complainant sent letter of thanks to the Honorable Wafaqi Mohtasib.

4. Ms. Salma Versus Capital Development Authority

Grievance: The roots of eucalyptus tree outside the complainant's house were damaging boundary wall but the concerned agency i.e. CDA was reluctant to cut the tree.

IRD process: Since the CDA have not paying attention to the repeated request of the complainant and as the huge trees eucalyptus started damaging the foundation of the building and resultantly hazardous to the human lives if not timely removed, the matter was dealt with under Article 33 of P.O 1 of 1983. The site was visited in the presence of the complainant and the Agency's representatives who, after detailed discussion, agreed to resolve the issue on immediate basis.

Remedy: The Agency has resolved the issue of complainant after getting approval by the competent authority.

Remarks: The IRD complaint was disposed of: The complainant sent a letter of thanks to the Honorable Wafaqi Mohtasib.

5. Mr. Azmat Ayub versus Directorate General of Immigration and Passport.

Grievance: The complainant an overseas Pakistani residing in Kosovo, requested for issuance of passport to his new born baby so that she could travel to Pakistan, but the agency was reluctant to issue the passport.

IRD process: This issue pertains to overseas Pakistani and in urgent need of passport, Article 33 of the P.O 1 of 1983 was invoked to redress the grievance of the complainant. The representative of the Agency attended two hearings at this secretariat and after discussion and verification, agreed to issue the passport.

Remedy: Machine readable passport was issued in respect of the complainant's daughter.

Remarks: the IRD case was disposed off. The complainant sent letter of thanks to the Honorable Wafaqi Mohtasib.

IRD SELECTED STORIES PRESENTED BY DR. MUHAMMAD ZAHID
SENIOR INVESTIGATING OFFICER IN CHARGE, WMS, BHAWALPUR

1. Mr. M Usman Saeed Versus Mr. Muhammad Sanwal

The complainant submitted that one Mr. M. Sanwal served at his Tuck shop for the period of 05-months, after submitting guarantee cheque (Blank). During Audit of the A/c for the impugned period, it had been observed that Rs.87000/- was short (embezzlement). The alleged employee was requested to pay the embezzled amount, but in vain. Mr. Muhammad Sanwal was contacted and he visited the office and apprised that all the allegations were baseless and also argued that the Tuck shop owner was not paying his salary for five months. Both the parties were called for mediation on 25.3.2022, which was attended by both the parties.

During the process of mediation it was observed that the matter pertains to cash shortage not embezzlement and there were two other persons (including the owner) handled the cash counter during the impugned period. However, after detailed discussion on the issue and necessary calculation, both the parties agreed to the extent that:

- i. 20% profit margin on the items would be deducted from the cash shortage amount (87000-18000=69000).
- ii. Remaining Rs.69000/- would be divided on all the three cash counter attendants equally (Rs.23000/- each).
- iii. The remaining salary amount of Mr. Sanwal Rs.10000/- would also be deducted from his share of cash shortage.
- iv. After 15-days from the agreement, Mr. Sanwal paid Rs.13000/- to Mr. Usman Saeed and received from him his guarantee cheque.

2. Mr. Munawar Hussain vs Mr. Amanat Ali

The Complainant submitted that one Mr. Munawar Hussain, a neighbor of the complainant and Cattle Farm owner, was throwing the livestock manure in the street, which was hazardous for their health due to smell and hygienic issues. Mr. Amanat Ali was contacted over his given cell number and both the parties were called for conciliation on 21-04-2022.

Both the parties attended the office and matter was discussed in detail. Mr. Amanat Ali, apprised that after receiving call from this Secretariat, he had removed the livestock manure from the street and also promised that he would never use the street for dumping of livestock manure.

3. Mst. Abida Parween Versus Paksitan Rangers

The complainant submitted a complaint against Pakistan Ranger, wherein it was inscribed that the Agency was delaying in transferring of his family pension, which was unjustified. The matter was taken up with the Agency under IRD and contacted telephonically for redressal of the grievance of the complainant expeditiously.

The complainant, on 13-04-2022, apprised that her grievance has been redressed as her family pension had been transferred in her name.

IRD SELECTED STORIES PRESENTED BY MR. GHULAM SARWAR BROHI,
ASSOCIATE ADVISOR/REGIONAL HEAD WMS QUETTA

1. SSGCL, 35 Crore.

Cases of SSGC amounting to Rs. 35 crores came before us which were fixed on consumers as punishment but received bill were not deposited in the account of the company fraudulently in collusion with the officials of the company. On the intervention of this office, the said amount was deposited in the account of the company and inquiry ordered for disciplinary action.

2. SIMs Cases.

1000 cases of Sims issued fraudulently came up which we solved informally. We came to know that in Musakhel, illegal Sims were issued and being used in the name of women who were completely unaware about the said sims and even had no mobile phones. We have closed all the unauthorized Sims by taking FIA and PTA in the loop to prevent this illegal activity.

3. Passport Office Sibi Camera Cases.

We visited the passport office in Sibi. There were no cameras available for four months. We took notice of the issue and asked passport head office Quetta for the provision of camera. Next day, the cameras were provided as per requirement.

4. NADRA Dhadar Printer Case.

When we visited the office of NADRA, Dhadar there was no printer available. We took notice of the matter and asked NADRA Head Office for Provision of the printer, the next day the printer was fixed and working started smoothly.

5. Custom Cases Buffalo/Blankets.

The customs officials seized two trucks full of buffaloes which were being transported to Pishin worth Rs.25 Lakhs. We asked customs Authorities regarding confiscation of buffaloes which were auctioned by authorities. After due process of the auction, the payment was made to the owner as it was proved that these buffaloes were not transported illegally.

6. Railway Police Parcel Cases.

There were 70 parcels seized by the railway police, we called the railway Authorities and the customs official. After checking the parcels for any contraband items, all the parcels were returned to the addressee.

IRD SELECTED STORIES PRESENTED BY MR. SHAHZADA ALLAUDDIN,
INCHARGE, WMS REGIONAL OFFICE, KHARAN

1. BISP

Federal Ombudsman intervention redressed the grievances of BISP beneficiaries such as:

- i. ATMs were non-functional and beneficiaries were facing issues and challenges during withdrawal, Visited HBL Kharan & Nushki Branches interacted with Kifalat Beneficiaries, assessed the quality of cash withdrawal service through ATM, directed concerned official's, issue resolved within 36 hours.
- ii. 100 finger print issue resolved in BISP and their payments were made through non biometric verification system from HBL.
- iii. BISP beneficiaries were facing transaction issues in District Nushki. After complaints more HBL connect devices approval were made.
- iv. Retailers were involved in deduction/corrupt financial practices. On the intervention of Federal Ombudsman, 4 retailers at Kharan were black listed.

2. Pakistan Television (PTV)

Pakistan Television Rebroadcast Station (RBS) was non-functional since 2008, which started transmission after Federal Ombudsman intervention.

3. NADRA

- i. During the visit and complaints of general public, it was observed that there is no proper sitting arrangement and facilitation for the people who wait for their turn in the office, not even a shade and people have to bear the brunt of hot sun during the day. On direction of Federal Ombudsman, approval for shading for visitors was made by NADRA.
- ii. On four complaints against NADRA regarding payment of office rent, Rs.400,000/- paid to each complainant against their claim.

4. Quetta Electric Supply Company (QUESCO)

- i. More than 92 HT and 57 LT Electric poles were erected and fixed in different areas of Kharan, Nushki, Chagai, and Washuk.
- ii. Three numbers of feeders were installed at Kharan and Nushki.
- iii. 16 New and 58 damaged Transformer were repaired and reinstalled after Federal Ombudsman intervention (Kharan, Nushki, Chagai and Washuk).

5. SSGC

Applicant deposited the required amount for new domestic connections. After receiving the fee, the gas connections were approved and SSGCL was bound to install gas meters at the consumer's premises. However the procedure was not followed and consumers were waiting for many years. On Federal Ombudsman intervention, Company official installed 70 gas meters in District Nushki.

6. Utility Store Corporation USC

- a) Ahmed Wall Utility Store reopened.
- b) After complaints of general public, paid surprised visits to different utility stores and directed officials for ensuring availability of essential items at lower prices. Within 24 hours essential commodities (flour, sugar, ghee, rice and pulses) provided to stores of Kharan and Chagai District in the Holy Month of Ramadan.

7. Baluchistan Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education Quetta Baluchistan (BBISE).

- a) 35 new appointed Levies Force Personals applied for verification of their degrees and certificate from BBISE, Quetta Baluchistan. As per policy applicants had to wait for more than ten days to get their documents verified. Due to financial issues and pressure they had to submit their documents within three days. They approached Federal Ombudsman for verification of their degree from BBISE, Quetta. Federal Ombudsman Regional Office Kharan approached Secretary Board and negotiated with him and their degrees were verified within three days. The applicants have thanked the Ombudsman Office for its effective role in ensuring in this regard.
 - b) After intervention of Federal Ombudsman, applicant namely Sabir Ali got corrected his name and date of birth from BBISE Quetta in the light of school record and examination form. New corrected certificate issued by Board in favour of applicant.
-