

*Order Sheet*  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI  
**Crl. Misc. Appl. No. 720 of 2025**

Date	Order with Signature of Judge
------	-------------------------------

Fresh Case

- 1.For order on MA No. 11404/25 (urgent)
- 2.For order on MA No. 11405/25 (exemption)
- 3.For hearing of bail application

**15.08.2025**

Mr. Irfan Gul Memon, Advocate for the Applicant.

-----

- 1. Urgency granted.
- 2. Exemption is granted subject to all just exceptions.
- 3. The Applicant, Haresh Kumar, is aggrieved by the impugned order dated 07.08.2025, passed by the Ex-Officio Justice of Peace Sujawal, rejecting his Criminal Misc. Application No.212/2025 filed under Section 22-A(6)(i)&(iii) Cr.P.C. to record his statement and register an FIR against the proposed accused/respondents who are officers of HESCO/WAPDA. According to the documents available on record and submissions of Counsel, since 2018, Haresh Kumar is the owner of a sub-plot measuring 250 sq. yds., which sub-plot he acquired from Peomal. It is not entirely clear if the applicant's current neighbour, Syed Shafqat Hussain Shah, was the prior owner of the sub-plot; however, the applicant alleges that he completed construction of his residence on the said sub-plot only this year (in 2025). According to him, the proposed accused officers of HESCO approached him concerning an unpaid bill relating to Consumer No.02372720002660 (Old Account No.Ai), and extorted from him a sum of Rs.50,000/-. However, the documents filed by the applicant have annexed a HESCO bill/invoice with the same Consumer no. associated with Syed Shafqat Hussain Shah, showing a deposit of Rs.50,000/-. Counsel for the applicant contended that Haresh Kumar is not responsible for Syed Shafqat Hussain Shah's electricity bill. The Ex-Officio Justice of Peace observed in the impugned order that there was a dispute between the Applicant and HESCO over arrears of electricity and denial of responsibility towards settlement of such bill/arrears, on the ground that the same was the responsibility of the previous owner and not the current owner (applicant). The Ex-Officio Justice of Peace concluded that no criminal act was made out in the facts and circumstances of the case, and the competent forum should decide the issues between the applicant and HESCO/WAPDA.

Heard Counsel. When I queried Counsel if the proposed accused had extorted any amount over and above the amount of Rs.50,000, he responded in the negative. Further, while Counsel has attached photos of solar panels, he does not deny having an electricity connection at his residence, nor has he produced any paid or payable electricity bill, nor does he deny that the sum of Rs.50,000/- handed over to the proposed accused officers of HESCO/WAPDA was not utilised towards part-payment of the above-mentioned consumer invoice. No crime appears to have been triggered, calling for the recording of the applicant's statement before the Respondent Police Authorities.

I have considered the impugned order and do not find any defect in the said order—accordingly, the instant Criminal Misc. Application is dismissed.

**J U D G E**