

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

**Constitution Petition No. 358 of 2025**

| <b>DATE</b> | <b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGES</b> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|
|-------------|---------------------------------------|

Fresh Case

1. For orders on CMA No.3040/2025 (U/A).
2. For orders on office objections 1 to 3 & reply of advocate as at 'A'.
3. For orders on CMA No.3041/2025 (Exemption).
4. For orders on CMA No.3042/2025 (Stay).
5. For hearing of main case.

**29.04.2025**

Sardar Sheraz Anjum, Advocate for the Petitioner.

.....

1. Urgency granted.
- 2–5. Learned counsel has impugned the judgment dated 17.03.2025 passed in First Rent Appeal No.226.2023. The above First Rent Appeal emanated from the impugned judgment dated 06.11.2023 passed in Rent Case No.489/2017. The said Rent Case was filed by Respondent No.1 under Section 15 of the Sindh Rented Premises Ordinance, 1979 (**“the Ordinance”**) on the grounds of default and personal bonafide need.

Bare perusal of the judgment of the trial Court dated 06.11.2023 reveals that the ejectment application was allowed on both the grounds of default and personal bonafide need. Thereafter the above mentioned First Rent Appeal was filed, which was also dismissed vide impugned order. Learned counsel for the Petitioner argued that he was not aware about the ownership of the Applicant/landlord as the Applicant has not informed him. He has further contended that the Petitioner has filed a Civil Suit No.1599/2018 against the Applicant/landlord for permanent injunction and thereafter the Applicant/landlord has preferred the above Rent Case.

I have examined the order of the learned trial Court. The learned trial Court has correctly held that not a single question was put to the Applicant by the counsel of the opponent regarding personal bonafide need. I have also taken the liberty to

examine the cross-examination of the Applicant and it appears that findings given by the learned Rent Controller is correct.

In light of above discussion no case for interference in the judgments of both the Courts below is made. Accordingly, the instant petition along with the pending applications is dismissed in limine with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

Nadeem Qureshi “PA”