

Scenario 63

HATS OFF TO A CJP (Justice Dogar)

On 16th January 2009 during the final hearing of an issue before the Islamabad High Court (IHC), a petitioner Azam Khan Sultanpuri, who was one of the challengers of extra 21 marks awarded to one Farah Hameed Dogar, argued that the Chairman, Federal Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education (FBISE) acted in gross violation of the rules while awarding extra marks to the daughter of Justice Abdul Hameed Dogar, Chief Justice of Pakistan (CJP). The Court held that:

'There is nothing wrong in the marks increased in re-evaluation by the experts in the field and no exception can be taken by this court to the procedure adopted by the Chairman (Federal Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education) and the re-evaluation made by examiners.

In order to foster the principle of justice a wrong had to be remedied. In the absence of a statutory provision, residuary power rests with the authority to undo manifest case of victimization by the examiners.

An examinee may not suffer in his career on account of incorrect marks awarded by a sub - or head-examiner, in the absence of supervisory power with the board or the university directing re-evaluation.'

Chief Justice Sardar Mohammad Aslam of IHC observed as above while rejecting the two petitions for being without merit. The petitions were moved by Iftikhar Hussain Rajput and M Azam Khan Sultanpuri of the *Tehreek Falah e Pakistan*. The 14-page court order also asked the Secretary of the Ministry of Education (MoE), the controlling authority of the FBISE, to consider the possibility of bringing an amendment to the board rules to provide a procedure for re-evaluation of papers.

Going into details of the judgment; two samples of Miss Farah Hameed Dogar's answer sheets were made part of the Islamabad High Court's judgment to prove 'irregularities' that were cited as the reason for re-assessment of her papers. In one case pertaining to the paper of Physics II, despite her answer being incorrect, Miss Farah was given two marks while that part carried only one mark. In case of Urdu paper, despite making four mistakes in a two-line answer, she was given two marks out of three.

Ansar Abbasi, an Islamabad based correspondent, (Ref: **'the News' dated 19th January 2009**) after announcement of the judgment, obtained question papers of Physics II and Urdu for the FBISE Examinations 2008 and compared the same with the two samples reproduced in the IHC judgment. The comparison revealed that the judgment pointed out a wrong answer for the Physics II answer reproduced in the verdict.

On page 13, the judgment said:

'On visual examination of Physics-II paper, answer to question No 5(b) is given below: "No, the plates of capacitor are not of different sizes; however to decrease the electrostatic factor a dielectric medium is put in between them.' Then the judge wrote: 'The examiner crossed the question and awarded zero mark. Later on, he gave one mark. On re-evaluation (re-assessment), another mark was added.'

Meaning thereby that in this particular question of the paper, the candidate got two marks.

The question paper, however, had shown that the above answer pertained to XIV (b) of Q.2, which reads as: "A capacitor is connected across a battery: (b) Is this true even if the plates are of different sizes?"

It carried total one mark as part XIV, having three sub-parts — a, b and c — had total three marks. Against the answer reproduced above, the candidate, when reassessed, got two marks against the part that carried only one mark. It means even if Miss Farah's answer was 100 per cent correct, she would not have got more than one mark, but she got two.

The Chairman Department of Physics, Quaid e Azam University Islamabad, Dr Hoodbhoy, when contacted for opinion, said that in the above given sample in which Miss Farah was given two marks after the controversial reassessment, she actually deserved zero.

In Urdu paper, according to the judgment, one mark was awarded in answer to a question, reproduced in the judgment, while after re-assessment; the candidate was given an additional mark. The question paper of Urdu had shown that the question — 2(i) [asking about Babar's toughness] carried total three marks, out of which Miss Farah got two marks despite making two spelling mistakes and two mistakes of idioms. In a language paper, spelling and grammatical mistakes are taken seriously, but in Miss Farah's case, after one mark, she was given two marks.

After reproducing the two samples and details of marks originally given and revised, the IHC's judge said:

'I do find some of the irregularities in other papers too. In such a situation, when the chairman examined the answer books of the papers in dispute, he made a decision, rightly so to direct re-assessment.'

'There is nothing wrong in the marks increased in re-evaluation by the experts in the field and no exception can be taken by this court to the procedure adopted by (the) Chairman and the re-evaluation made by examiners.'

Overlooking such scandalous flaws, the above ruling of the judge left many questions to ponder upon our Pakistani system of extending personal benefits and favours to brother judges flouting the prevailing norms and taking damn care of the judiciary's reputation.

Going into more details of the IHC's verdict in this case, the law knowing people and educationists had declared it as full of flaws, discrepancies, inconsistencies and inaccuracies. A careful reading of the 14-page decision shows; on page 7 for instance, that the judge, perhaps confusing re-checking with re-assessment, gave a misplaced ruling:

'Bare reading shows that an embargo has been placed on re-assessment of any answer book until publication of the result.'

Rule 1.5 (a), quoted in the FBISE's rules and copied in the verdict, reads:

'The answer book of a candidate in any examination shall not be re-assessed under any circumstances. However, after the publication of the results of the board's examination, if a candidate, whether passed or failed, has strong grounds and belief that some mistake has been made in connection with his results, he / she may apply to the Controller of Examination (Secrecy) on prescribed application form along with attested photocopies of marks sheet for re-checking of his answer book, in one paper or more as the case may be, on payment of prescribed fee.'

This rule speaks of 're-checking,' not about 're-assessment' and only after the publication of the result, but the IHC judge's observation suggests as if re-assessment is allowed after declaration of result. The judgment simply omits Rule 1.5 (e), which, while explaining Rule 1.5 (a), reads that:

'Whereas the re-checking does not mean re-assessment or re-evaluation of the answer book, the chairman or any officer of the re-checking committee appointed by him shall see that:

- 1) There is no mistake in the grand total on the title page of the answer book;
- 2) The totals of various parts of question have been correctly made at the end of each question;
- 3) All totals have been correctly brought forward on the title page of the answer book;
- 4) No portion of any answer has been left unmarked;
- 5) Total marks in the answer book tally with the marks sheet;
- 6) The answer book or any part thereof has not been changed / detached;
- 7) The hand writing of the candidate tallies in the questions / answer books.'

Now the **second main issue**; IHC's judgment noted on page 5-6:

'The sole question requiring examination is whether the Chairman [FBISE] possessed any authority to direct re-assessment.

The board was created under the Federal Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education Act 1975. Section 11(4) confers absolute jurisdiction upon the chairman to see that provisions of this Act are faithfully observed and he shall exercise all powers necessary for this purpose.

Under Section 17, the board has been empowered to make regulations carrying out the purposes of this Act.'

But on page 7, the same judgment says:

'Regulations do not confer any power on the chairman to direct re-assessment / re-evaluation of any answer book but such a power does reside in him being the chief executive of the board.'

Moreover, the judgment seems to have omitted to ponder upon Clause 8 of Chapter 4 of the First Regulation of the Schedule of the Act titled '**Chairman's power in cases of hardship**' which says:

'..... The orders of the chairman, passed under this regulation, shall be reported to the board for information; provided that such orders of the chairman shall not alter the award of marks, obtained by a candidate or his result determined on the basis of that award.'

It is therefore, clear that the Board's Chairman had no authority to pass any order that could change the result of a candidate. Interestingly, while the judgment ruled that the chairman had such powers, the case file of Farah Dogar clearly said that: '**the chairman had passed the order for re-assessment in relaxation of the rules**'.

The Act, however, does not give such power at all and there was also no provision either in the Act or the rules allowing such a relaxation. It was a cogent fact that the Federal Board had favoured Farah Hameed, may be obliging government's instructions, during proceedings in the IHC by twisting and wrongly interpreting their own rules.

It is commonly known that in all universities and boards, the answer books of examinations are checked by examiners and then minimum 10% are rechecked by Head Examiners. When the checking procedure is complete, all lots of the papers are sealed in 'secrecy branch' from where it could only be taken out under orders of the chairman when required for re-checking (and not re-assessing). Each Head Examiner has to submit a certificate to the board under Rule 7.6L(4) that '**at least 10% papers have been re-checked**'. Under this rule this re-marking, re-checking or re-assessment by the head examiner can only be done before the results are announced.

While explaining this rule in the IHC the Chairman and his counsel produced this rule in a derogatory way conveying that perhaps this rule could also be applied after announcement of results. This rule was applicable as such in all the boards and university examination directorates across Pakistan and everywhere its sanctity was always kept in tact. So many times the higher courts were moved in some cases but the courts especially the Supreme Court always avoided to issue such decisions declaring all as 'technical matters'.

FACTORS BEHIND WRONG JUDGMENT:

In the said judgment dated 16th January 2009, the IHC had written that:

'On 21-08-2008, answer scripts of Farah Dogar were submitted to the chairman, who ordered on 10-09-2008: "Please have the answer book of this candidate re-assessed.'

The legal procedures first; the citing of judgments in all higher courts are substantiated on previous references of laws explained or rulings passed in similar or nearly similar cases. The analysis of the rulings used as basis of IHC's this decision comes up as; firstly, **PLD 1992 SC 263** (which does not issue any re-assessment order); the second case law - **1995 MLD 899** - points out flaws in the system and called for an elaborate mechanism against possible lapses of examiners, etc, but does not pass any direction to carry out re-assessment in any particular case.

The third case law pertains to a higher court seeking suitable amendments in the rules of a university so that "re-checking" of answer books in very genuine cases could be undertaken. Therefore, the case laws relied on in the IHC judgment either talk of the university system or of high court's decisions containing directions to make appropriate rules, none of them directly dealing with the re-assessment.

Thus most of the cited laws went irrelevant either because they pertained to universities or for the embargo laid down in the latest Supreme Court decisions. The Supreme Court, at numerous occasions, has categorically declared that re-assessment could result in the collapse of the whole education and examination systems. None of these Supreme Court rulings was cited in the IHC judgment. These SC rulings were **1996 SCMR 676**, **1996 SCMR 1872**, and **2002 SCMR 504**. None of these case laws have directly ordered re-assessment but speak in general terms about framing of such rules.

The latest SC ruling (**CP No. 248 / 2002 written in 2004**), cited in the said Farah Hameed's case of the IHC basically restores powers of a vice-chancellor to direct re-evaluation which was taken back earlier from him by deletion of rule. It was done to keep a check and balance system in the university affairs. It seeks the reversal of the deleted power of the vice-chancellor to order re-evaluation and nothing to do with a question of re-assessment in a board's examination.

The intelligentsia believed that this derogatory decision was probably given by Justice Sardar Aslam Khan of the IHC, because he was otherwise retiring in March that year and was hoping to be elevated to the Supreme Court as a reward for according a judicial certificate to a blatantly wrong action. His three-year extension in service was expected to be considered as a present for handing down the ruling in the said case of enhancing 21 marks of Farah Dogar in her intermediate papers through unprecedented re-assessment and re-marking.

The bar members in all chambers of Islamabad were comparing it with the past appointment of a CJP Irshad Hasan Khan as Chief Election Commissioner (CEC) after his retirement.

'As Chief Justice, while heading an enlarged Supreme Court bench, he had not only validated Gen Musharraf's October 1999 military coup but had also given him three years to rule, and in return got three years as Chief Election Commissioner.'

There was more criticism on this decision of the IHC from all corners. The former **Acting CJ BhagwanDas** had opined that this decision of the IHC was against the basic principles of justice and prevailing legal provisions. In his opinion the Board (FBISE) had acted against the constitution of Pakistan because in this way the rights of equality for all was twisted and used to favour only one candidate because she was a daughter of the sitting CJ.

Acting CJ BhagwanDas especially quoted an example that if today son of a farmer gets top of the examination, tomorrow a feudal lord may use his influence and wealth and by means of this law he would get his son at the top.

CJ (Rtd) Saeduzzaman Siddiqui told the pressmen that this decision must be challenged in the SC otherwise all the universities and boards would be under obligation to exercise and make use of it as law and it would become extremely hard and complicated for the education departments to survive with floods of applications after every exam.

Justice (Rtd) Wajihuddin Ahmed opined that this decision would be very detrimental for noble cause of education as a whole; if not fought against. He opined that:

'We've been receiving applications against the boards and authorities but in this Farah's case the applicant and the board were on the same side; very astonishing.'

'This decision has not been drafted by a court, it seems. Only the courts acting under PCO or Martial Law provisions can announce such judgments; media should keep on pointing such flaws for the public so that the justice should find its natural way.'

Barrister Akram Sheikh, Justice (Rtd) Tariq Mehmood, Senator S M Zafar, and Justice (Rtd) Fakhrudin G Ahmed had also conveyed similar feelings rather in more bitter words.

To summarize opinions of the above legal minds: *'if the re-evaluation could serve as a check on arbitrariness, casualness and negligent attitude of the examiner, it would benefit only the dominant people, who would be in a position to twist the arms of the chairmen of the examining boards to favour their kith and kin. This ruling can open the floodgates of massive fraud, abuse, misuse, manipulation and exploitation of the system by the mighty, high-placed and well-connected people in future.'*

Quoting an opinion from **'the News' dated 20th January 2009**:

'One can disagree with the IHC Chief's observation that (to foster the principle of justice a wrong has to be remedied); in fact, a wrong has been condoned and reinforced in the instant case.'

'A bad judicial precedent has been set. The chiefs of the examining boards and universities have now been armed with extraordinary authority. Its exercise would benefit only the children of the privileged, rich and wealthy people. The ruling has paved the way for favouritism, nepotism and an open discrimination.'

JUSTICE ACCOMMODATED: FULL DETAILS:

Farah Hameed Dogar had appeared in Intermediate (pre-medical) Part II examination 2008 under Role No; 545207. The result of the said exam was announced on 4th August 2008. In the result Farah Dogar secured 640 marks out of 1100 and thus awarded 'Grade C'. Farah Dogar, on 20th August 2008 had tendered an application to the Board for re-checking of her four papers i.e. English II, Urdu II, Pakistan Studies and Physics II.

The office hands of the Board received orders of the Chairman, written on Farah's original application of 20th August 2008 that: ***'I would like to see her answer books myself also.'***

On 21st August, 2008 the Assistant Controller Examinations had sent the earlier mentioned answer sheets to the Chairman through his Controller Examinations. On receiving claims of

Farah Dogar complaining 'wrong marking' on her papers, the Chairman on 10th September 2008 ordered in writing that **'this candidate's (Farah Dogar) answer sheets be re-assessed'**.

On 29th August, Farah Dogar submitted another application to the Board requesting to re-check two more papers; Chemistry II & Biology II.

Under the rules, all the papers were placed before the Re-Checking Committee. On re-checking it was found that there is a mistake of only one mark of Question no: 4 of Biology II Paper whereas there was found no mistake in the rest of the five papers. Approval of the competent authority was sought on 3rd September 2008 for an increase on one mark in Biology II paper of Farah Dogar.

But it was not considered enough.

A special arrangement was made by the Chairman of the Board to get Farah Dogar's papers processed again by passing through an arranged conspiracy of 're-assessment'.

The experts in concerned subjects and the head examiners were pressurized to complete the whole process of re-assessment as per instructions of the chairman. The manoeuvred details then cropped up as:

- The head examiners of two papers, Pakistan Studies & Chemistry II, had declared that the marking on their answer sheets were as per 'marking scheme' and did not need change.
- The head examiner of Biology II made up an increase of one (1) mark in Question 4 which was left over in counting by mistake.
- The head examiner of English II paper changed his assessment from 58 marks to 67 & a half.
- The head examiner of Urdu II paper changed his assessment from 62 marks to 67 & a half.
- The head examiner of Physics II paper changed his assessment from 32 marks to 38.

Once the Chairman had also written on Farah's file '**perused the record.**' However, it is worth mentioning here that the Chairman's orders for re-assessment "**in relaxation of rules;**" were not valid which were probably made under immense pressure from the Chief Justice's office.

It is also on record that the applicant Farah Dogar had requested to recheck her six papers in two applications but only four papers could be re-assessed. In fact the head examiners of Chemistry II and Pakistan Studies had flatly refused to obey Chairman's orders for this illegal re-assessment. Again when the Chairman was subjected to more pressure, he had to note the above mentioned words on the file that: **'I would like to see her answer books myself also.'**

In nut shell Farah Dogar got total addition of 21 marks in her score. 20 marks were awarded as a result of re-assessment whereas one mark was added up which was left over in counting by mistake. The chairman had accorded **approval of this increase of 21 marks for her on 15th September 2008.**

This addition in marks brought an improvement of Farah's overall grade from 'C' to 'B'. The same day of 15th September 2008, the Controller of Examination issued / prepared an amended Mark Sheet with amended figure of 661 marks & amended grade of 'B' and personally handed over to the Chairman.

Media got smell of the whole exercise in F.B.I.S.E and the matter came out open in public. Immediately after, two petitions each from Iftikhar Hussain Rajput and M Azam Khan Sultanpuri

of the *Tehreek Falah e Pakistan* were moved in the Islamabad High Court which were thrown away tagged with the aforementioned judgment.

The decision totally omitted the fact that a re-checking committee — as provided for under the rules — was formed, which gave only one additional mark because of the re-counting and unanimously concluded that except one mark in Biology all other five papers were '**Checked & Found Correct**' (CFC). Dissatisfied with the addition of just one mark, the chairman later sought re-evaluation.

Strange enough that the Federal Board (FBISE) itself positioned before the Islamabad High Court along with applicant Farah Dogar and appraised the court that the board had used its powers under the rules and Law and awarded additional marks to the applicant as per available provisions.

While submitting para-wise comments in the said court the Board maintained they had not committed any irregularity while awarding additional marks to the applicant and they had done so within their powers. It was also suggested to the court that under provisions of Rule 1.2(1), the Chairman of FBISE could not be questioned in an administrative or legal proceeding and that the Board has powers under section 4 of 1975's Law to get action and implementation by all available means.

There was no mention of the fact before the court that Farah Dogar was one of about 1000 candidates who had applied to the board for allowing re-checking but only Farah's case was taken up for re-evaluation despite a clear legal bar. There was no explanation or reason offered on file as to how Farah's case was different from the rest of the candidates.

Evidently, the chairman had exercised this authority in the case because she was the daughter of the sitting CJP. Sources in the FBISE had confirmed that Miss Farah's was the only case where the answer sheets were re-assessed. While doing so the Board's Chairman ignored the fact that in all similar cases, the board or university concerned had always refused re-assessment on applications from candidates.

Some people had approached the courts in the past but in none of the cases the board or university had ever been ordered to re-assess any paper as was uniquely done in the case of Farah Dogar.

Submitting para-wise comments on the petition of Muhammad Azam Sultanpuri, the Board (FBISE) did not reply paras 1 & 2. While replying para 3, the Board admitted that total 201 candidates / applicants of this examination, including Farah Hameed Dogar, had been given an increase in their marks and grades.

It was not purposefully made clear that out of these 201 candidates how many were re-assessed like Farah Dogar. In fact there was only ONE candidate named Farah Dogar who had been considered eligible for re-assessment. The rest of the 200 applicants were subjected to avail benefit of re-checking only.

While answering this paragraph the Board had also tried to justify by saying that:

'In 2005, the FBSIE received 740 applications for rechecking and 73 candidates were awarded more marks. In 2006, the Board received 884 applications for rechecking and 132 candidates were awarded more marks. In 2007, the Board received 1104 applications for rechecking and 136 candidates were awarded more marks.'

COE: THE NATION NEEDS YOU:

In this regard, interview of the **Controller of Examination**, Muzaffar ul Hassan, taken and recorded by one M Ahmed Noorani of '*Daily Jang*' dated **15th January 2008** was worth consideration.

Mr Muzaffar, attached with the FBISE since its first day's launching at Islamabad and kept an optimum reputation of honesty and straight forwardness. He first time, after Farah Dogar's case in offing, opened his mouth when he realized that his ex-boss & ex-Chairman Air Commodore (R) Sharif Shamshad had spoken a blatant lie on oath before the IHC while giving his testimony in the judicial proceeding.

Mr Muzaffar stated that ex-Chairman Shamshad had misled the court. He disturbingly told the media that ex-chairman had told a lie in the court because '**Rule 7.6L(4) does not give permission for re-assessments by head examiners.**' Under this rule the re-checking and re-assessment by head examiners could only be made before announcement of the result. After announcement of result no officer has an authority to re-assess the papers. In the case of Farah, re-assessment was made after the result.

Mr Muzaffar also stated the fact that **throughout his career of about 33 years in FBISE he had never seen such an event in the board.** He had never taken part in such re-assessment exercise using this rule after announcement of result nor did he ever witness such glaring violation of this rule.

Mr Muzaffar confirmed that in total 201 candidates were given an increase in their marks. Out of 201 applicants, 200 candidates were given benefit of a mistake in their totals (generally called re-checking). During this exercise Farah had also got one mark as addition, making 641 from originally secured 640 marks, due to mistake of totals in her Biology II paper. Only one applicant Farah Dogar got the benefit of getting her papers re-assessed under specific orders of the Chairman.

The process of evaluating the correctness of the case was in the offing when suddenly the Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee [MNA Abid Sher Ali] took serious turn announcing that:

'The Committee intends to summon the CJP Justice Dogar to explain his conduct in the capacity of Farah's father.'

Naturally it was taken as a revenge from PML(N) on their years old stance that PCO judges should be removed and the judiciary of 2nd November 2007 should be reinstated by the sitting PPP government.

The sitting judiciary in CJP Dogar's Supreme Court planned to block that move in a different way. Therefore, on 5th December 2008, the High Court while taking up a petition, had stayed the probe by the standing committee into the matter, and later dismissed the petition.

{It is a point to keep on record that the IHC Chief had initially refused to stay the ongoing proceedings in the Parliamentary standing committee on education on Farah Dogar case.

Tormented by the refusal, a stay was then managed from a single judge of the Supreme Court on 5th December. It was all done by the sitting government to save Chief Justice Dogar from being dragged in the controversy.}

On 13th December, Farah Hameed Dogar personally came out in her defence saying that her career had no grey area and her blotless performance in school and college could be verified. This issue agitated many minds. Federal Minister for Education Mir Hazar Khan Bijarani himself explained (on 19th January 2009) while commenting on the IHC's decision on Farah Dogar case that:

'There is no rule or provision for reassessment / remarking of papers after announcement of examination results under any circumstances and, if allowed, it will open a Pandora's box which will damage the country's education system.

*We will take all possible measures against..... **but only after the record are returned to us.** But it is again asserted that reassessment is not allowed under any law and under any circumstances whatsoever.'*

It is interesting to mention that President Zardari's block of companions was bent upon to save CJP Dogar in this quagmire. Though at last Farook Naik, the Federal Minister for Law and Lateef Khosa, the Attorney General of Pakistan made their way through on the basis of blatant lies which brought worse name to their offices and the PPP.

The MoE and the Ministry of Law gave wrong impressions to the court that all the 201 applicants had got the facility of reassessment whereas the fact was that only one case was considered for re-assessment and the rest of 200 applicants got their marks increased through re-checking.

Lateef Khosa, later backed out saying that he was not involved in the game nor was he authorized to vet the comments submitted by Chairman FBISE. The PM Gilani was not in favour of interfering in this dirty game, neither in the Parliament nor outside. Contrarily the moment he came to know that his Press Secretary Mr Bashir had facilitated a private meeting between Ansar Abbasi and the CJ Dogar (in December 2008); he immediately fired the officer and sent him home.

GEN ZIAUL HAQ'S GIMMICKS:

PML(N) Information Secretary Ahsan Iqbal then said that the said decision had strengthened PML(N)'s fears on PCO judges that these judges lacked the courage to give decisions against the wishes of those in the power corridors.

Just for a change of taste here, their attention is invited towards an historical event of Gen Ziaul Haq era, when:

'A politician close to him had requested him for the favour of admitting his daughter in Army Medical College Rawalpindi which had then sixty seats. Gen Zia sent her application to Gen Mirza Aslam Beg – then Deputy COAS with the remarks to accommodate her, who forwarded it to Major Gen Waheed Kakar the then Adjutant General (AG) for 'necessary action'.

*Gen Kakar, however, returned the file with the remarks **'Regrets, she doesn't come up to the merit.'** On his next routine visit to the GHQ, Gen Ziaul Haq just walked unannounced into the office of the AG [Gen Kakar] and confronted him with the application saying, **'I am sure, there must be a way out to admit her'**.*

*Gen Kakar, true to his reputation, stood his ground saying, 'Sir, under the rules I cannot. However, if you order it, I will admit her'. General Zia, probably resigning to the inevitable, started moving slowly towards the door but before reaching it turned back and asked where she stood on the merit list. **'Sir, she is 79th and we have only 60 seats'**, answered the AG.*

*With a flash rising to the occasion, **Gen Ziaul Haq ordered, 'increase the intake to 80 from this year'** and walked out triumphantly.'*

In the words of Col (Rtd) Riaz Jafri, *'rules were not violated and yet the ego vindicated.'*

But rules were seen flouted about one year later when illegal migration of Maryam Nawaz Sharif from Army Medical College, Rawalpindi to the K E Medical College, Lahore was pre-arranged, managed, ordered and affected.