

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI**

**Present:**

**Mr. Justice Muhammad Saleem Jessar  
Mr. Justice Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro**

**Constitution Petition No. D-7369 of 2021**

(Muhammad Bilal and others v. Government of Sindh through Chief Secretary,  
Sindh and others)

Petitioners : Through Mr. Abdul Salam Memon,  
Advocate

Respondents : Through M/s. Hakim Ali Shaikh and Sageer  
Ahmed Abbasi, Additional Advocates  
General, Sindh alongwith Mr. Raza Mian, DSP  
(Legal-II), CPO, Karachi

Date of hearing : 15.04.2026  
and order

**ORDER**

**Muhammad Saleem Jessar, J:-** Through this petition, the petitioners claim following relief:-

- a) Declare and direct the respondents that after acceptance of and verification of subsequent Domicile Certificates with the address in same district and same particulars petitioners be issued appointment orders.
- b) Declare the earlier domiciles issued to the petitioners (annexed as "D"), bonafide obtained by the petitioners and petitioners are the victim of circumstances.
- c) Direct the respondents that in the scam of fake Domicile Certificates issued from the office of the concerned Deputy Commissioners criminal proceedings be initiated against the responsible officers and agents.
- d) Any other relief(s), as this Honorable court deems appropriate in the facts and the circumstances of the case be awarded to the Petitioners.
- e) Cost of the petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners had applied for the post of Police Constable and submitted their domiciles, which, upon verification, were found to be fake. However, they subsequently obtained and submitted

genuine domiciles. He further submitted that the petitioners were deceived into obtaining forged domiciles, although they actually belong to the same area, and are now in possession of valid domiciles; therefore, they may be considered for appointment. He also contended that, under similar circumstances, other police constables were appointed. He, therefore, prayed to allow this petition on the touchstone of Article 25 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973.

3. Learned Additional Advocate General, Sindh, while controverting the above submissions, contended that although the petitioners had passed the recruitment test, their domiciles were found to be bogus; therefore, their candidature was rightly rejected. He further submitted that the petitioners, by their own conduct, committed gross misconduct and, thus, cannot be considered afresh. He accordingly prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the material available on record.

5. It is an admitted position that the petitioners applied for appointment to the post of Police Constable and successfully passed the recruitment process; however, upon scrutiny, their domiciles were declared bogus by the concerned Deputy Commissioner's office. Under the Recruitment Policy, 2019, it is incumbent upon every candidate to furnish correct information regarding their credentials. As recruitment of police constables is based on a district-wise quota, the petitioners were required to submit correct documents, including domicile and PRC. Any incorrect information automatically disentitled a candidate from employment, and their candidature stands rejected in terms of para 4.1.8 of the Recruitment Policy, 2019, which reads as under:

“No certificates or copies of certificates are to be attached with the application. Instead every applicant will sign a declaration on the application form itself undertaking that the information furnished by him in the application form is true and correct. The actual information of original certificates will be done only in respect of

candidates who are called for "Interview" and any applicant having made an incorrect or false declaration shall stand disqualified automatically at that stage."

6. A perusal of the above policy clearly shows that furnishing incorrect information is sufficient ground for cancellation of candidature. Moreover, while submitting their applications, the petitioners furnished undertakings affirming genuineness of their documents and the correctness of the information provided. Such undertakings were found to be false due to submission of bogus domicile certificates. There is no provision for submission of fresh documents once the initially submitted documents are found to be bogus. The petitioners have failed to point out any illegality or infirmity in the rejection of their candidature warranting interference by this Court in its constitutional jurisdiction.

7. For the foregoing reasons, no case for indulgence is made out. Accordingly, this petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

Judge  
Head of Const. Benches

Judge