

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

**C.P. No. D-297 of 2026**

*[Faisal V. Federation of Pakistan and others]*

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

Before:

Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon  
Mr. Justice Zulfiqar Ali Sangi

**Date of hearing and Order: 22.04.2026**

Mr. Yasir Ali Jokhio, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. Wajiha Mahdi, Assistant Attorney General.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ORDER**

**Adnan-ul-Karim Memon, J.** – The petitioner, Faisal, has filed a Constitutional Petition under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, seeking removal of his name from the Blacklist/Passport Control List (PCL) and suspension of travel restrictions, primarily on the ground of urgency due to the imminent expiry of his Saudi visa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner, a Pakistani citizen employed in Saudi Arabia, was implicated in FIR No. 323/2025 under Sections 419/420 PPC registered at FIA AHTC Karachi, but was subsequently acquitted by the competent court on 29.10.2025. Despite his acquittal, his name continues to remain on the Blacklist/PCL, restricting his travel and jeopardizing his employment, visa status, and livelihood. It was further submitted that although a request for removal of his name was submitted on 11.11.2025, no action has been taken by the authorities. The continued placement on the list is termed illegal, arbitrary, and violative of his constitutional rights.

3. On the other hand, the learned Assistant Attorney General, appearing for Respondents submitted that the respondent No.4 is not the competent authority to remove the petitioner's name from the PCL, and that Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 were/are the relevant authorities to consider such request on merits in accordance with law. However in spite her best efforts she could not be able to obtain their stance and comments.

4. It was noted by this Court that despite directions issued on 16.02.2026 to place on record any material against the petitioner, no such material was/is produced by the respondents, nor did Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 submit any response, this is their lethargic attitude toward the court of law, therefore the competent authority of the respondents must take disciplinary action against the

delinquent officials forthwith and compliance report shall be submitted to this court through Nazir of this Court.

5. In view of the above, and consistent with the settled principles already enunciated by the Supreme Court as well as this Court in similar matters, it is held that the continued placement of the petitioner's name on the Passport Control List, despite his acquittal and in the absence of any incriminating material, is wholly without lawful authority and cannot be sustained. It is by now a well-recognized principle that inclusion of a citizen's name in the PCL/Blacklist has serious civil consequences, directly impinging upon the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution, particularly the right to movement and to pursue lawful employment. Such restriction, therefore, must be based on cogent material and exercised strictly in accordance with law, and not on mere inaction or administrative indifference.

6. In the present case, not only have the respondents failed to justify the impugned action, but they have also disregarded the clear directions of this Court to place relevant material on record. The persistent failure of Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to appear or file comments reflects a lack of due diligence and renders the continuation of the petitioner's name on the PCL arbitrary, unreasonable, and violative of due process.

7. Accordingly, while reaffirming the earlier directions, this Court holds that if no adverse material exists against the petitioner, there remains no legal justification to curtail his fundamental rights. Therefore this petition needs to be disposed of with direction to the Review Committee so constituted to hear the petitioner and act fairly, expeditiously, and strictly in accordance with law, within three weeks' time and any failure to do so shall entail legal consequences, as the petitioner, having already suffered undue hardship, is entitled to immediate and effective consideration of his case within three weeks' time. However, it is made clear that if the case of the petitioner is not decided by the Review Committee his name shall be removed from the PCL without further deliberation.

8. This petition along with pending application(s) stands disposed of in the above terms.

Let a copy of this order be communicated to all concerned including learned AAG for compliance in time.

JUDGE

JUDGE