CASE ANALYSIS

FCC Rejects Tariq Nadeem’s PTV Regularisation Claim After Special Pay Election

Tariq Nadeem’s move to PTV’s Special Pay Scale defeated his claim to regularisation. The Federal Constitutional Court held that his special pay and benefits dated from his 2013 election.

By Shahbaz Shah · 26 November 2026

Tariq Nadeem v. Pakistan Television Corporation · C.P.L.A. No. 2792 of 2024

Download judgment PDF · Judgment page



AI-generated editorial illustration for Shahbaz Shah Legal Journal.

Pakistan Television Corporation employee Tariq Nadeem opted into a Special Pay Scale on terms that excluded regularisation. The Federal Constitutional Court held him to that election and refused leave to appeal against the dismissal of his writ petition. The judges also held that he was entitled to the pay and benefits of the new scale from 26 January 2013, the day he chose it. PTV had made the package effective from 1 July 2020. Judgment, paragraphs 8-10.

How the pay arrangement changed

Nadeem joined PTV as a resource person for a weekly programme in 1989 and began working on contract in 1998. He became Resource Person (IT) in 2005. Under a PTV circular of 17 May 2011, staff who chose the Special Pay Scale agreed to forgo regularisation. Nadeem applied for the new scale on 26 January 2013. PTV placed him on it in November 2022 and later made the package retrospective to July 2020. His salary and petrol allowance were increased in August 2023. Judgment, paragraphs 3-6.

Nadeem had already taken an earlier termination to the Islamabad High Court. In 2019 the High Court set aside that termination and required PTV’s board to give a reasoned decision on his regularisation request under the applicable service rules. PTV terminated his services again on 29 December 2023, and the High Court dismissed his fresh writ petition on 30 April 2024. The Federal Constitutional Court heard his challenge to that dismissal. Judgment, paragraphs 5-7.

Why the earlier regularisation claim failed

Nadeem relied on a precedent linking the regularisation of eligible contract workers to the right to livelihood under Article 9. The FCC accepted the principle subject to the applicable legal conditions and eligibility criteria. It found that Nadeem's voluntary election took him out of the group covered by the regularisation scheme. His acceptance of the special pay and other benefits supported the Court's application of estoppel. Judgment, paragraph 2 and paragraphs 8-9.

The judges relied on *Muhammad Rafiullah v. Zarai Taraqiati Bank Limited*, 2018 SCMR 598, for the effect of freely choosing and receiving benefits under a changed employment arrangement. Here, the terms of the 2011 offer, Nadeem's own application and his receipt of the benefits established that choice. For a case involving eligibility under a different regularisation scheme, see our analysis of employer-controlled tests and regular status. Judgment, paragraph 9.

Why the 2013 date still matters

The bench used the date of Nadeem's election to determine when his entitlement under the new arrangement began. It identified 26 January 2013 as the effective date for special pay and other SPS benefits and left the amount for the earlier period open. The final order dismissed the petition and refused leave, leaving the Islamabad High Court's judgment in place. Judgment, paragraph 8 and final order.

Official court PDF · FCC judgment register.

Frequently asked questions

What did the FCC decide about Tariq Nadeem's regularisation?

The Court held that he ceased to qualify under PTV's relevant contract-worker regularisation scheme when he voluntarily chose the Special Pay Scale on the terms offered. Judgment, paragraphs 8-9.

When did his Special Pay Scale benefits start?

The Court stated that he was entitled to SPS pay and benefits from 26 January 2013, the date of his option. Judgment, paragraph 8.

What made estoppel relevant?

Nadeem consciously chose the new terms and received the corresponding benefits. The Court held him to that election when he claimed rights under his earlier, incompatible status. Judgment, paragraph 9.

What happened to the Islamabad High Court ruling?

The FCC dismissed the petition and refused leave to appeal. The High Court's dismissal of the writ petition stands. Judgment, paragraph 10.