



**OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL OMBUDSPERSON  
FOR PROTECTION AGAINST HARASSMENT OF WOMEN  
AT THE WORKPLACE, REGIONAL OFFICE, SINDH**

**FORM OF ORDER SHEET**

**Complaint No. 521/2025**

**MS. FEHMIDA SIYAL**

**V/S**

**MS. ASMA ALI**

**Date of Institution: 04.09.2025**

**Name of Organization: PAKISTAN STANDARD & QUALITY CONTROL AUTHORITY  
(PSQCA)**

**ORDER**

**Date: 12/05/2026**

**Sr. No: 29**

1. *The Complainant, Mst. Fehmida Siyal, a Junior Computer Operator working in the Secretary's Office of Pakistan Standard & Quality Control Authority (PSQCA), Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of Pakistan, Karachi, has been in continuous government service since the year 2008. She filed the instant complaint under Section 8 of the Protection Against Harassment of Women at Workplace Act, 2010 (hereinafter referred to as "the 2010 Act") against Asma Ali, a Lower Division Clerk (Project) serving in the Legal Department of PSQCA, Karachi.*

2. The Complainant alleges that she has been subjected to a sustained, deliberate, and escalating pattern of sexual harassment by the Accused since May 2025. The allegations, in their chronological progression, are as follows:

**1st Allegation:** On 14.05.2025, the Accused entered the Complainant's office, touched her hair, and remarked, "You have beautiful hair, you are also beautiful, I like you very much since the beginning, and you should use shampoo for your hair". A whatsapp message followed at 10:42 PM with a shampoo image (Ex C-1/2).

**2nd Allegation:** On 22.05.2025, the Accused sent a cake to the Complainant through Kashif (Peon) and personally remarked, "I would like to eat what you leave behind, as it is a symbol of my affection for you; and you are very beautiful. She subsequently sent cooked fish on 12.06.2025 through Masood (Peon) and personally stated, "Mere sath khush raha karo, mein tumhein pasand karti hun" (Roughly translated as: "Stay happy with me, I like you very much").

**3rd Allegation:** On 13.06.2025, the Accused slapped the Complainant on the back. The Complainant feared reporting due to threats from the Accused.

**4th Allegation:** On 17.06.2025, the Accused made remarks about the Complainant's lipstick, touched her lips without consent, took the lipstick to the washroom, applied it, returned it, and stated, "Tum mere sath washroom chalo aur mujhe kiss karne do" (Roughly translated: "Come with me to the washroom and let me kiss you").

**5th Allegation:** On 02.07.2025, the Accused stated, "Aaj tou tum bohat khoobsurat lag rahi ho aur yeh make-up tum par bohat acha lag raha hai" (Roughly translated: "Today you look very beautiful and this makeup suits you very well"), sat uninvited on the Complainant's lap and forcibly touched her chest.

**6th Allegation:** The Accused repeatedly entered the office without authorization, occupied the Complainant's chair, handled her official and personal files without consent, and made unauthorized use of her workstation. She recorded videos of the Complainant within the office premises, for tiktok, without her consent.

**7th Allegation:** The Accused called the Complainant "Badtameez (rude)", in the presence of colleagues.

**8th Allegation:** On 22.07.2025, the Accused stated, "Tum mere sath us din bhi washroom nai chali, ab tou tumhein mere sath washroom chalna hi chalna hoga" (Roughly translated: "You did not come with me to the washroom that day; now you will have to come with me"), made obscene inquiries about the Complainant's undergarments, and forcibly touched her chest. The Complainant resisted.

**9th Allegation:** The Accused threatened that false FIRs would be lodged against her if she refused her advances. She claimed to have connections with police, judges, and government agencies, and threatened to use them against the Complainant.

**10th Allegation:** Between 23.07.2025 and 31.07.2025, the Accused pulled the Complainant's hair and slapped her in the presence of witnesses. On 25.07.2025,

she demanded, “Tum mujhe apni tasweerein aur videos do, mujhe tum behad pasand ho, tum mujhe bohat achi lagti ho” (Roughly translated: “Send me your pictures and videos; I like you very much; I find you very attractive”).

**11th Allegation:** The Accused issued a legal notice (Ex C-1/6) to the Complainant as a retaliatory measure.

**12th Allegation:** On 03.09.2025, the Accused, accompanied by her Legal Counsel entered the Complainant’s office, misbehaved, used abusive language and allegedly physically assaulted the Complainant in the presence of Saifullah Larik, Hamza, Sajjad Ali (Naib Qasid), Vikash (Sweeper), Liaquat (Security Guard), Abdul Sani (KPO Legal), and Zubair Nomani (Director Legal). She stated “Aap kya samajhti hain apne aap ko? Aap jaisi kai log mein pehle bhi dekh chuki hun. Mere rishtedaar judge aur afsar hain. Main aap ko dekh loongi” (Roughly translated: “What do you think of yourself? I have seen many like you before. My relatives are judges and officers. I will deal with you”). The Complainant submitted an application dated 04.09.2025 requesting CCTV footage of the incident.

3. The Complainant has accordingly prayed that the Accused be penalized under the Protection Against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act, 2010, that a major penalty be imposed, that the Accused be placed under suspension pending finalization of the complaint, and that any other relief deemed just and proper be granted. The Complainant submits that due to the repeated acts of harassment, intimidation, and misconduct, she has suffered severe mental agony, stress, humiliation, and disruption in the performance of her official duties.

4. In support of her allegations, the Complainant has placed on record three photographs bearing a timestamp of 3:53 PM on 04.09.2025 (Ex C-1/3), a WhatsApp screenshot dated 14.05.2025 at 10:42 PM depicting an image of shampoo (Ex C-1/2), copies of letters dated 04.08.2025 and 04.09.2025 addressed to the DD Admin, PSQCA alleging misconduct, illegal entry, harassment, physical assault and threats by the Accused (Ex C-1/5), an undated legal notice issued by the Accused to the Complainant (Ex C-1/6), and a reply thereto dated 04.09.2025 submitted by the Complainant (Ex C-1/7).

5. To substantiate her allegations, the Complainant has relied on her own testimony as well as the statements of witnesses, namely, Sajjad (Naib Qasid) [appeared as CW-1], Saifullah (Naib Qasid) [appeared as CW-2], and Abdullah (Assistant Finance) [appeared as CW-4]. The evidence of Liaquat (Security Guard) has not been considered due to his non-appearance before this Forum.

6. The procedural history preceding the filing of the instant complaint before this Forum is relevant to understanding the context of these allegations. Prior to approaching this Forum, the following proceedings had transpired between the parties. The Complainant lodged a formal complaint with the Secretary, PSQCA, dated 04.08.2025, detailing allegations of harassment, unauthorized entry, interference with official work, and physical assault by the Accused. She subsequently filed a second complaint with the Department dated 04.09.2025, received on 08.09.2025, wherein she additionally alleged an incident on 03.09.2025 wherein the Accused, along with her legal counsel, entered

*her office and allegedly assaulted her. She further sought provision of CCTV footage and initiation of departmental proceedings.*

7. *Concurrently, an exchange of legal notices took place between the parties, wherein the Accused served a notice in August 2025, which was replied to by the Complainant on 04.09.2025. The Complainant also filed a petition under Sections 22-A and 22-B of the Criminal Procedure Code before the District Court East, which was disposed of on 27.09.2025. Following the Complainant's departmental complaint, an office order dated 22.10.2025 was issued scheduling an inquiry; however, the Complainant, vide application dated 23.10.2025, withdrew her complaint from the Department on the ground that she had no confidence in the Inquiry Committee and intended to pursue her complaint before this Forum. The withdrawal of the departmental complaint accordingly vests exclusive jurisdiction in this Forum to examine the matter on merits.*

8. *It is pertinent to note that the Accused had also filed a complaint dated 15.07.2025 before the Department, alleging that the Complainant engaged in obstructive and unprofessional conduct, including hindrance in official duties, use of derogatory remarks in the presence of colleagues, and spreading false allegations to damage her professional reputation. The Accused attributed such conduct to internal administrative disputes relating to seating and transfers.*

9. *Conversely, the Accused has denied all allegations in the present complaint before this Forum, submitting that the complaint has been filed out of professional jealousy and personal animosity. She maintains that she has never committed any act of harassment. She further points out that the Complainant had previously filed an application under Sections 22-A and 22-B Cr.P.C arising from the same events, but with materially different allegations, an inconsistency which, she submits, exposes the mala fide intent behind the present complaint. The Accused also contends that the Complainant has concealed material facts from this Forum and has not approached it with clean hands.*

10. *The Accused has further submitted that the Complainant is allegedly undergoing treatment for a brain tumor/brain cancer, and that, on this account, she generally maintained a distance from her.*

11. *On the nature of their relationship, the Accused submits that the parties interacted as normal colleagues. She states that the Complainant herself gave her gifts including an abaya and Sindhi traditional articles, and that any items she gave were simply reciprocal gestures with no ulterior intent. As regards the shampoo, the Accused submits that she mentioned her sister used locally made shampoo during a conversation, the Complainant expressed interest and asked for a picture, and she shared it accordingly. She maintains this was an ordinary exchange between colleagues.*

12. *With respect to the food items, the Accused offers a different account. She submits that it was the Complainant who brought a chocolate cake to the office on one occasion, which was shared among staff generally. On another occasion, she bought a cake from a bakery which was similarly shared. As for the fish, she submits that Jamal Mustafa from the Admin Branch collected contributions from staff and arranged for fish to be cooked*

*for the entire office. After prayer, the Accused joined the female colleagues for the meal and she and the Complainant happened to eat together. She maintains that these ordinary workplace interactions have been deliberately misrepresented.*

*13. The Accused further submits that it was the Complainant who would send peons to invite the Accused for lunch, and that any visits to the Complainant's office were made with the permission of the Head of the Legal Department, Zubair Nomani. She also explains that during July 2025, the air conditioner in the Director's office had broken down, requiring staff to work together in a common area, and that multiple employees can confirm that the Complainant was neither harassed nor subjected to any mental torture during this period.*

*14. The Accused has submitted that she has never engaged in any inappropriate conduct, including making derogatory remarks, using abusive language, entering the Complainant's office without permission, interfering with her work, or engaging in any form of physical contact or misconduct. She has further denied having intimidated the Complainant, threatening her with false cases, claimed influence through relatives, or demanded photographs or videos through any staff member, including Naib Qasid Sajjad Ali. With respect to the allegation regarding TikTok videos, it is submitted that any such recordings were made with the consent of the Complainant. It is also stated that no formal or verbal directions were ever issued against the Accused by the Department, nor were any such directions disregarded.*

*15. With regard to the allegations pertaining to the incidents of July and September 2025, the Accused submits that the same are fabricated, exaggerated, and based on distorted versions of routine workplace interactions. It is contended that the allegations do not fall within the ambit of Section 8 of the Protection Against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act, 2010, and that the Complainant has failed to substantiate her claims through any credible or corroborative evidence. Accordingly, the Accused has prayed that the present complaint be dismissed with costs and has opposed the relief sought by the Complainant.*

*16. In rebuttal, the Accused has relied upon her own testimony. In support of her defence, she has placed on record her reply submitted before the Harassment Committee (Ex D-1/2) in respect of the departmental complaint dated 23.10.2025, the Confirmation of Regularization Order dated 20.07.2023 (Ex D-1/3), Letter of Appreciation dated 15.05.2017 (Ex D-1/4), NTS Result dated 17.10.2016 (Ex D-1/5), Call Letter for PSQCA Test (marked as D-1/6), NTS Roll Number Slip (Ex D-1/7), PSQCA Service Regulation Rules, 2015 (Ex D-1/8), an application dated 05.01.2024 addressed to the Secretary, PSQCA (marked as D-1/9), order dated 27.09.2025 (Ex D-1/10) passed by the Learned Additional District Judge in the application under Section 22-A and 22-B along with objections (Ex D-1/11) filed therein, a complaint dated 15.07.2025 against the Complainant (Ex D-1/12), and screenshots along with voice note conversations between the Accused and the Deputy Director (Admin), Waheed Memon (Ex D-1/13).*

*17. At the stage of final arguments, Learned Counsel for the Complainant reiterated the contents of the complaint. It is however noted that during the course of arguments, reference was made to an additional incident not forming part of the complaint, wherein*

*the Complainant alleged that on one occasion while descending stairs, the Accused touched her from behind in an inappropriate manner, which was witnessed by Kashif (Peon), who laughed. As this incident was neither pleaded in the complaint nor supported by any evidence on record, it has not been taken into consideration in these proceedings. The Complainant further clarified that the Accused did not make TikTok videos of her, but instead used to make videos of herself within the Complainant's office.*

18. *She further stated that the Accused interacted with her child on separate occasions and gave gifts to the child which the Complainant reciprocated by gifting her a dupatta. Learned Counsel for the Complainant submitted that an application dated 04.08.2025 was filed, but no effective action was taken despite verbal complaints to senior officers. It was further submitted that separate proceedings under Sections 22-A and 22-B Cr.P.C. were initiated regarding physical assault and trespass.*

19. *Regarding the incident of 03.09.2025, reliance was placed by the Learned Counsel on the testimonies of Sajjad and Saifullah as to their presence at the relevant time and their observation of an altercation, on Abdullah's testimony regarding prior conduct of the Accused and the Complainant's distressed condition after the incident. Counsel submitted that the Accused gave contradictory statements during cross-examination and failed to produce any defence witness. It was further submitted that similar conduct was also observed by other employees, though they did not come forward.*

20. *Counsel argued that the Complainant faced pressure to withdraw the complaint, including external influence by the Accused. It was argued that the entire sequence of incidents from mid-June to August 2025 demonstrates a continuing pattern of conduct culminating in the incident dated 03.09.2025. It was further submitted that the alleged conduct falls within the ambit of Section 2(h) of the 2010 Act, constituting both unwelcome physical conduct and a hostile work environment.*

21. *The Learned Counsel for the Accused reiterated the Accused's version and contended that no credible, independent, or documentary evidence has been produced to establish harassment within the meaning of the Protection against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act, 2010. It was argued that the allegations rest on verbal assertions, assumptions, and conjecture, and remain uncorroborated by any audio, video, documentary, or independent eyewitness evidence despite their seriousness. He further claimed that on 03.09.2025, the date of the alleged incident, the Accused was on medical leave for three days, and in support thereof an attendance record and a medical prescription were produced.*

22. *The Counsel argued that the Complainant failed to produce material witnesses, while those examined either lacked direct knowledge of the alleged incidents or were otherwise unreliable on account of bias or hearsay. Allegations relating to digital material, including videos and TikTok recordings, were also stated to remain unsubstantiated. It was contended that the departmental proceedings suffered from procedural irregularities, including violation of the principles of natural justice, particularly audi alteram partem, and that the inquiry was not concluded independently. The Learned Counsel relied upon the settled principles of law governing burden of proof and appreciation of evidence, and placed reliance on **PLD 2009 SC 53, 1995 SCLR 1345 [Tariq Pervez v. The State]**, and*

**2018 SCMR 772 [Muhammad Mansha v. The State]**, submitting that where evidence is doubtful, inconsistent, or not confidence-inspiring, the Accused is entitled to the benefit of doubt as a matter of right. It was contended that serious allegations cannot be sustained on hearsay or uncorroborated statements, and must be proved through credible, cogent, and independent evidence.

23. Having heard the full arguments of both parties and examined the record placed before this Forum, the following key questions arise for determination:

a. Whether the conduct of the Accused falls within the definition of harassment as provided under Section 2(h) of the Protection Against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act, 2010?

b. Whether the parties have adequately substantiated their respective claims through credible evidence and testimony?

24. These questions shall be determined on the balance of probabilities, being the applicable standard in proceedings under the 2010 Act, as elaborated further herein.

25. To answer the first question, it is necessary to determine whether the alleged conduct falls within the definition of “harassment” under Section 2(h) of the Protection Against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act, 2010, by considering both the nature of the acts and their impact on the workplace environment. Section 2(h) covers any unwelcome sexual advance, request for sexual favours, or other verbal, visual, or physical conduct of a sexual nature, as well as behaviour that creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment or interferes with an employee’s ability to perform her duties.

26. In the present case, the Complainant has levelled a series of serious allegations, including unwelcome physical contact, inappropriate remarks of a personal and alleged sexual nature, repeated entry into her office without consent, sending of gifts and food items, interference with her official work, threats, and an incident of alleged physical assault on 03.09.2025. These allegations, taken at their face value, describe conduct which, if established through reliable evidence, would fall within the ambit of Section 2(h) of the Act.

27. However, the core question on which the fate of this case rests is whether these allegations have been substantiated through credible and cogent evidence sufficient to establish a preponderance of probability.

28. The Complainant has primarily relied upon her own testimony, which is detailed and narrates a sequence of events over a period of time. Witness Sajjad has deposed regarding the Accused’s presence in the Complainant’s office and general interactional matters, but has admitted that he did not witness any incident of physical or sexual misconduct. Saifullah has stated that the Accused did not have a designated seat in the Complainant’s office and was provided a chair when she visited. He has further stated that on 03.09.2025 he saw the Accused enter the Complainant’s office along with her Counsel and later heard heated exchange of arguments; however, he has admitted that he did not witness what transpired inside the room. His testimony also reflects

*inconsistencies regarding the circumstances of his presence outside the room. Witness Abdullah testified that the Accused, who was directed in 2023 to assist in the Finance Department, was observed taking photographs of official cheques and confidential documents. He made a verbal complaint to his in-charge, after which her presence in the Finance Department was discontinued. He further stated that she engaged in similar conduct with other employees, involving unnecessary office entries and interference with work. Staff members generally avoid the Accused and several complaints have been made against her. She has been transferred to approximately six to seven departments. However, Abdullah is not a witness to any interaction between the parties regarding the allegations of harassment in the present complaint.*

*29. The Forum has further noted that the Complainant, vide application dated 04.09.2025, specifically requested provision of CCTV footage of the incident of 03.09.2025. It is on record that the CCTV cameras installed within PSQCA were non-functional at the relevant time, a fact brought to the notice of this Forum during proceedings. Accordingly, no adverse inference shall be drawn against the Complainant due to the non-availability of CCTV footage.*

*30. Further, the record, as reflected from the statements of witnesses Sajjad and Saifullah, indicates a cordial relationship between the parties, including sitting together, sharing meals, and exchanging gifts, as well as the Accused interacting with the Complainant's child in a friendly manner. While such prior cordiality does not, in itself, rule out the possibility of subsequent harassment, it forms part of the surrounding circumstances relevant to the overall assessment of the allegations. In this context, allegations of a serious and progressively escalating nature require clear, consistent, and independent corroboration on material particulars, which is not forthcoming in the present case.*

*31. The documentary evidence on record is limited. The WhatsApp communication produced by the Complainant relates to a message regarding shampoo and does not, in itself, indicate conduct of a sexual nature. The Complainant's allegation that the Accused made remarks about her appearance is not supported by the content of the communication produced. It is further noted that the photographs bear a timestamp of 3:53 PM on 04.09.2025, whereas the alleged incident is stated to have occurred on 03.09.2025. The photographs were therefore taken a day after the alleged occurrence and are not contemporaneous. While this delay does not, by itself, render the photographs unreliable, it reduces their value as immediate corroboration. In the absence of any supporting material, the photographs do not establish the alleged physical assault or harassment.*

*32. It is also relevant that the earlier departmental complaints dated 04.08.2025 and 04.09.2025, as well as the initial complaint filed before this Forum, predominantly relate to allegations of workplace interference, unauthorized entry, and disruption of official work. Notably, these complaints do not contain allegations of conduct of a sexual nature. While subsequent elaboration of facts is not uncommon, the absence of contemporaneous reference to such serious allegations is a circumstance that requires stronger independent corroboration in support of the later narrative, which is not sufficiently available on record.*

33. *In proceedings under the Act, direct evidence may not always be available and reliance on circumstantial evidence is accordingly permissible. However, such evidence must form a coherent and consistent chain pointing towards the alleged misconduct and establish a clear probability of the alleged acts. In the present case, while certain circumstances have been brought on record, including workplace interaction between the parties, alleged entry into office premises, and strained relations, these do not form a complete or unbroken chain establishing the specific allegations of harassment of a sexual or physical nature. The material on record remains equally open to alternate interpretation, including workplace discord and interpersonal conflict, and therefore does not conclusively support the Complainant's version.*

34. *Further, the complaint filed by the Accused against the Complainant, dated 15.07.2025 and forming part of the record, indicates that an underlying dispute existed between the parties and competing versions of events. In this context, the timing of the respective complaints is relevant for appreciating the background of the dispute and the possibility of parallel grievances between the parties, rather than a one-sided narrative.*

35. *The Forum has considered the objection raised by the Learned Counsel for the Complainant to the admission of the voice notes at the evidence stage and finds that the same were produced during the examination-in-chief of the Accused and form part of the record duly exhibited, and are accordingly admissible and have been taken into consideration. The Forum has further considered the voice notes placed on record by the Accused, including one voice note of 4 minutes and 26 seconds dated 12.08.2025, as well as three voice notes of 0:25, 0:09, and 0:08 minutes dated 21.08.2025, addressed to the Director Administration, Waheed Memon. In the voice note dated 12.08.2025, the Accused has referred to an ongoing dispute with the Complainant and alleged that the Complainant misbehaved with her. In the voice notes dated 21.08.2025, the Accused has raised concerns regarding her seating arrangement and requested administrative intervention for proper placement. This material, read together with the Accused's complaint dated 15.07.2025, supports the conclusion that workplace tensions had already surfaced contemporaneously with the alleged incidents forming the subject matter of the present complaint.*

36. *On the other hand, the contention of the Accused that the present complaint stems from professional jealousy and personal animosity, allegedly arising from differential treatment by higher authorities, does not find sufficient support from the material available on record. Further, the claim that the Complainant is suffering from a brain tumor and that the Accused deliberately maintained distance from her on that account has also remained unsubstantiated, as no medical record or independent evidence has been placed on record to support the said assertion. Lastly, the Accused's claim that she was on medical leave on 03.09.2025 was raised for the first time during final arguments and was not disclosed in her written defence or earlier submissions. The belated introduction of this claim, without prior notice, reduces its evidentiary value.*

37. *In such circumstances, the said incident cannot be viewed as the culmination of a continuing pattern of harassment as alleged by the Complainant, but rather an isolated occurrence arising out of strained interpersonal relations within the workplace. The statements of the witnesses, when read in conjunction with the overall record, also do not*

*establish a consistent or corroborated account of the specific allegations raised, and at best indicate the possibility of an altercation or heated exchange between the parties on the said date.*

*38. The conduct attributed to the Accused in relation to the alleged incident of 03.09.2025, based on the available evidence, reflects inappropriate behaviour and may amount to misconduct in a workplace setting. Nonetheless, the same does not, on the basis of the material available before this Forum, fall within the ambit of harassment as defined under Section 2(h) of the 2010 Act. It is further noted that the matter relating to the said incident is stated to have been separately agitated before a Court of Law, and accordingly, any findings in that regard are beyond the scope of this Forum's jurisdiction.*

*39. This Forum further notes that the Act draws no distinction between same-sex and opposite-sex harassment. The credibility of the Complainant's account is to be assessed on the same standard regardless of the gender of the Accused, and no higher evidentiary burden attaches merely because both parties are women.*

*40. In view of the foregoing, this Forum finds that the Complainant has not been able to substantiate the allegations through credible and cogent evidence sufficient to establish a preponderance of probability. The Complainant's testimony stands largely uncorroborated. The witnesses either did not witness the alleged incidents or testified to surrounding circumstances that are ambiguous, consistent with either friendship or harassment. The documentary evidence does not independently establish the alleged physical or sexual conduct. The circumstantial evidence (prior gift-giving, office visits, shared meals) is insufficient to establish that sexual harassment occurred. While the Forum recognizes that harassment often occurs without direct eyewitnesses, the standard remains: credible evidence must establish probability. That threshold has not been met.*

*41. For the reasons recorded above, the complaint is dismissed.*

*42. Before parting with this Order, the Forum deems it necessary to record certain observations and issue directions arising from the proceedings.*

*43. The material on record reflects a pattern of serious institutional failure on the part of PSQCA. An employee against whom multiple verbal complaints had been made across several departments continued to operate without a formal posting order since 2023, moving between departments without authorization and accessing colleagues' workspaces without institutional sanction. The CCTV cameras installed within the premises were non-functional, depriving this Forum and the Complainant of potentially material evidence. When the Complainant raised her grievances before the department, the response was limited to verbal directions that were neither documented nor enforced. These are not peripheral concerns, they reflect systemic gaps in workplace governance that create the very conditions in which harassment and discord can flourish unchecked.*

*44. Accordingly, this Forum directs the competent authority at PSQCA to ensure that an effective anti-harassment policy and complaint mechanism is in place and widely disseminated among all employees, and that mandatory awareness sessions on the 2010*

*Act are conducted within ninety (90) days of receipt of this Order, within which period compliance shall be reported to this Forum.*

*45. The competent authority is further advised that, given the non-functional state of CCTV infrastructure observed during these proceedings, ensuring that such systems remain operational at all times is an essential institutional safeguard.*

**FAUZIA VIQAR**

**FEDERAL OMBUDSPERSON**