

ORDER SHEET
HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD
C.P No.D-38 of 2026

[*Syed Shahid Hussain v. Federation of Pakistan and 03 others*]

| DATE | ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE(S) |
|-------------|---|
|-------------|---|

1. For orders on M.A No.143/2026 (U/A)
2. For orders on office objection (s)
3. For orders on M.A No.144/2026 (Exemption)
4. For hearing of main case

15.01.2026

Petitioner is present in person

The petitioner, appearing in person, has invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution, seeking a series of directions to the Federation and its agencies regarding electricity tariffs, the provision of housing for homeless citizens and the creation of employment opportunities within the Hyderabad region. The petition is presented as a public-interest initiative and is founded upon broad assertions regarding rising electricity costs, inadequate shelter for vulnerable groups and unemployment among the local population.

2. We have heard the petitioner and examined the material placed on record. The reliefs sought, *inter alia*, the provision of free electricity up to a fixed threshold, the formulation of housing schemes and the creation of employment opportunities are matters of policy, planning, and fiscal prioritisation, lying squarely within the domain of the Executive and the Legislature. The constitutional jurisdiction of this Court is directed towards examining the legality of specific executive or legislative actions and enforcing fundamental rights; it does not extend to designing socio-economic policy frameworks or directing allocation of public resources in a particular manner.

3. The petition does not challenge any identifiable notification, tariff determination, regulation or concrete act or omission of a public authority as being *ultra vires*, *mala fide*, discriminatory or otherwise without lawful authority.

Instead, it proceeds on the basis of generalised assertions regarding systemic deficiencies. In the absence of a defined, justiciable cause of action, no writ can be issued.

4. Although reliance has been placed upon Articles 9, 4, 14, 18, 25 and 38 of the Constitution, it is noted that Article 38 forms part of the Principle Policy, which is not directly enforceable through judicial proceedings. While these principles guide the State in framing policy and may inform constitutional interpretation, they cannot be converted into self-executing commands to mandate free utilities, guaranteed housing or employment by judicial order. To accede to such requests would amount to transgressing the doctrine of the separation of powers and to entering into functions reserved for the elected branches of Government.

5. In these circumstances and while acknowledging the importance of the issues highlighted, we are constrained to hold that the petition filed is not maintainable and does not warrant interference in the exercise of constitutional jurisdiction. Resultantly, this petition is **dismissed** in *limine* along with all pending applications.

JUDGE

JUDGE

AHSAN K. ABRO