

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI**

**C.P. No. D-3305 of 2026**  
*(Muhammad Hassan Raza v Federation of Pakistan & others)*

Date	Order with signature of Judge(s)
------	----------------------------------

**Before:-**  
**Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon**  
**Mr. Justice Adnan Iqbal Chaudhary**

**Date of hearing and Order: 08.07.2026**

Mr. Israr Ahmed Abro, Advocate for the petitioners.  
Ms. Samina Maqsood, Advocate for NADRA.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**ORDER**

**Adnan-ul-Karim Memon, J** The petitioner has filed this petition under Article 199 of the Constitution for seeking direction to restore/unblocking CNIC bearing No. 42201-0613813-7, as the petitioner is not an absconder in any crime or any enquiry.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was nominated in FIR No.130/2024 registered at FIA AHT Circle Karachi under Section 22(b) of the Emigration Ordinance, 1979, wherein his CNIC was blocked while he was abroad. Upon his return, he obtained transitory bail from this Court, joined the trial proceedings, pleaded guilty before the learned trial Court, and was dealt with leniently by imposing fine, whereafter the matter stood concluded. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner approached the learned Special Judge Central-II, Karachi for restoration/unblocking of his CNIC, however, the Investigating Officer opposed the application on the ground that certain inquiries and another criminal case bearing Crime No.141/2024 under Section 406 PPC were pending against him. It is contended that the petitioner is regularly appearing before the concerned Court and is neither absconding nor avoiding the process of law. It is urged that in the said proceedings, even the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, East Karachi directed NADRA for restoration of the petitioner's CNIC. It is argued that the purported pending inquiries have never been communicated to the petitioner, no notice has been issued to him, and no opportunity of hearing has been provided. The petitioner has always remained willing to join any inquiry whenever required. Learned counsel contends that merely referring to undisclosed inquiries cannot be a lawful justification for depriving the petitioner of his CNIC, particularly when he is participating in all pending proceedings. Learned counsel submits that blocking of the petitioner's CNIC without lawful authority has adversely affected his fundamental rights, and therefore, this Court directs the respondents to restore/unblock the petitioner's CNIC, as he is not a proclaimed offender and is cooperating with the legal process, as per required under the law.

3. Learned counsel for NADRA submits that, as per the report of V&R Branch RHO NADRA Karachi, the CNIC of the petitioner Muhammad Hassan Raza has been digitally impounded pursuant to court orders passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, East Karachi in FIR No.141/2024 in Case No.1991/2024 and learned Special Judge (Central)-II, Karachi in FIR No.130/2024 in Case No.44/2024). Learned counsel further submits that the CNIC can only be de-blocked upon receipt of appropriate orders from the respective courts which directed its blocking. She prayed to dismiss the petition.

4. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of NADRA and perused the available record.

5. It is an admitted position that the CNIC of the petitioner has not been blocked by NADRA on its own accord but pursuant to specific orders passed by the competent Courts in FIR No.141/2024 and FIR No.130/2024. The report submitted by NADRA clearly reflects that the digital impounding of the CNIC has been directed by the Court, and therefore, the authority of NADRA is confined to implementing and acting upon the orders of the competent Courts.

6. It is urged that the record further reveals that the petitioner has not been declared a proclaimed offender, nor has any material been placed before this Court showing that he is avoiding the process of law. On the contrary, the petitioner has joined the proceedings in both matters and has been appearing before the concerned Courts.

7. The mere pendency of criminal proceedings or inquiries, without any order declaring the petitioner absconding or restraining him from enjoying his lawful rights, cannot by itself justify an indefinite deprivation of his identity document.

8. It is a settled principle of law that the right to possess and use a Computerized National Identity Card is intrinsically connected with the right to identity, dignity, freedom of movement, and access to lawful activities guaranteed under Articles 4, 9, 14 and 15 of the Constitution. Any restriction imposed by a State functionary must have clear legal backing, must be proportionate to the purpose sought to be achieved, and cannot continue mechanically without periodic judicial scrutiny.

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan has repeatedly held that fundamental rights cannot be curtailed merely based on allegations, pending inquiries, or criminal proceedings unless the action is authorized by law and supported by valid reasons. The Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized that State authorities must act strictly in accordance with law and cannot subject citizens to arbitrary restrictions. Similarly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that executive

authorities are bound to exercise powers reasonably, fairly, and in conformity with constitutional guarantees.

10. We are of the view that blocking of CNICs is an exceptional measure and cannot be used as a substitute for criminal investigation or as a means of compelling attendance before investigating agencies. Such restrictions must be based upon lawful authority and continued only where necessary for the administration of justice, which factum is missing in the present case.

11. In the present case, since the blocking of the petitioner's CNIC was based upon orders passed by the learned Courts, this Court cannot directly substitute or set aside those orders in the present constitutional jurisdiction. However, because the petitioner is participating in the criminal proceedings, is not a proclaimed offender, as stated and NADRA itself has stated that de-blocking can only be undertaken upon receipt of appropriate orders from the concerned Courts, the petitioner is entitled to approach the said Courts for appropriate relief.

12. Accordingly, the instant petition is disposed of with direction to the petitioner to approach the learned Courts which passed the impugned orders of blocking of CNIC, and upon filing such applications, the learned Court shall decide the fate of the application within two weeks strictly in accordance with law, keeping in view the recent decision of the supreme court on the subject issue, after providing opportunity of hearing to all concerned.

13. Resultantly, the constitutional petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

JUDGE

JUDGE