

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR
C.P No.D-1283 of 2022

Date	Order with signature of Judge
1.	For orders on office objections
2.	For hearing of main case

Date of hearing: 25.08.2026

Date of Order: 08.10.2026

Mr. Hamayoun Shaikh, advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. Safdar Kamal, Assistant Director (Legal), NADRA
Syed Naveed Ahmed Shah, DAG

The Petitioner has challenged the blocking of his CNIC. It is his submission that the Petitioner is a citizen of Pakistan, and was accordingly given a National Identity Card in the year 1985. He submits that subsequently his National Identity Card has been repeatedly renewed by the Respondents, with the last such renewal being that of his Computerized National Identity Card bearing No.45504-1150807-5 in the year 2017.¹ Furthermore, he submits that when his daughter went to the Offices of Respondent No. 3/ NADRA to get her registration and apply for a CNIC with the NADRA database, she was informed that NADRA / Respondents No. 2 & 3 had blocked the Petitioner's CNIC. The Petitioner has filed the instant petition seeking, *inter-alia*, that since his CNIC was unlawfully blocked and no notice was issued to him in this regard nor was he given any opportunity of a proper hearing, hence the same was done unlawfully by the Respondents. He submits that the law holds specific provisions for the same, which have been denied to him, thereby depriving the Petitioner of his fundamentally rights guaranteed under the Constitution of Pakistan.

2. Counsel appearing on behalf of Respondents No. 2 & 3 submitted that the Petitioner is a Bangladeshi National, who came to Pakistan in the year 1981. Counsel further contends that the Petitioner applied and obtained a CNIC bearing No.45504-1150807-5, but submits that same was done through fraud. Respondents state that they had issued a Notice under Section 23 of NADRA Ordinance 2000, and that the case of the Petitioner was forwarded to the Zonal Revocation Centre Sukkur, where the Petitioner allegedly appeared but was unable to provide any

¹ Copies of his NIC / CNIC are attached along with the Memo of Petition

documentation. Accordingly, the Respondents state that they have blocked the Petitioner's CNIC.

3. We have heard learned Counsels and have gone through the record.

4. A perusal of the record shows that the Petitioner did indeed have a CNIC bearing No.45504-1150807-5. Furthermore, there is no evidence on record that proper due process was followed by the Respondents when blocking the Petitioner's CNIC. There is nothing showing that a Notice under Section 18 of the NADRA Ordinance 2000 was served upon the Petitioner, or that the Petitioner was duly heard prior to his CNIC being blocked.

5. The actions of the Respondents have resulted in depriving the Petitioner of his citizenship without even a hearing. It is needless to mention that deprivation of citizenship results in severe hardship on a daily basis for any person, which includes loss to daily life and livelihood, that are fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. Blocking of a CNIC is an extremely serious action, and one that cannot be taken lightly, as appears to have been done by the Respondents.

6. We find that the action taken by the Respondents in blocking the Petitioner's CNIC without following the complete process under the NADRA Ordinance 2000 (and other applicable citizenship laws) are draconian and has unduly deprived the Petitioner of his citizenship. Even otherwise, Para No. 5 of the Respondents No 2 & 3's Reply state they have not cancelled, confiscated or impounded the Petitioner's CNIC, but have *blocked* the same. However, they have failed to show under which provision of law such *blocking* was permitted, and what due process was followed prior to such *blocking*.

7. Therefore, the instant Petition is allowed and the Respondents are directed to unblock the Petitioner's CNIC with immediate effect. However, should the Respondents believe that there is any legal objection as to the validity of the Petitioner's citizenship / CNIC, they remain at liberty to follow the due process in accordance with the applicable laws, which include issuing a proper notice of hearing by an

authorized person, as well as providing the Petitioner a chance to be heard in the matter; after which they may proceed strictly in accordance with law. It is further noted that if the Respondents are desirous to take any action detrimental to the Petitioner's citizenship, the same ought to be done through a speaking order showing legal justification for their actions.

8. Accordingly, this Petition stands allowed in the aforementioned terms.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Faisal Mumtaz/PS