

**ORDER SHEET**  
**THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA**  
**C.P.No.D-383 of 2024**

*Thangai v/s. P.O.Sindh and others)*

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

For hearing of main case.

-----

**23.10.2025**

Mr. Ashfaque Hussain Abro, Advocate for the Petitioner

-----

The petitioner, an elected Vice Chairman of Union Council Aakhero, Kandhkot, District Kashmore, has invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, seeking directions against Respondents No. 1 to 5 for alleged acts of corruption, misappropriation of development funds, and denial of access to official records.

2. The gravamen of the petitioner's case is that, despite regular disbursement of substantial development funds to the Union Council, no commensurate development work has been executed. The petitioner alleges that Respondents No. 4 and 5, the Chairman and Secretary of the Union Council, have usurped public funds and obstructed transparency by refusing to share financial records.

3. Heard arguments and perused the record. Before delving into the factual matrix, it is imperative to address the threshold question of maintainability. As a public functionary, the petitioner seeks relief against other public officials within the same administrative hierarchy. The jurisprudential position on such intra-governmental disputes is well settled. The internal administrative grievances between public officials must be resolved through departmental mechanisms, not constitutional petitions. Article 199 is not a forum for resolving turf wars or administrative rivalries between functionaries of the State. The petitioner has not demonstrated any infringement of his personal legal rights or any violation of his fundamental rights under the Constitution. Though couched in the language of public interest, his grievance is in substance an administrative discord with his superior officers. The invocation of public interest litigation (PIL) is also misplaced. The PIL must be filed by a citizen acting in bona fide

public interest, not by an official seeking to vindicate his administrative standing.

4. The Sindh Local Government Act, 2013 ("the Act") provides a comprehensive framework for local governance. Section 18 delineates the composition of Union Councils and the roles of elected members, including the Vice Chairman. While the Vice Chairman is an elected representative, his powers are circumscribed by the Act. The Chairman is the executive head of the Union Council, and the Secretary is its principal administrative officer. Section 30 of the Act guarantees the right of access to information relating to budgets, expenditures, and development schemes. However, this right is conferred upon citizens generally and does not elevate the Vice Chairman to a supervisory role over the Chairman or Secretary. The Act also provides internal remedies. Section 88 empowers the Local Government Board to inquire into misconduct allegations. Section 89 allows for disciplinary action against officials found guilty of corruption or negligence.

5. The petitioner has not invoked these statutory remedies. His failure to exhaust the internal mechanisms provided under the Act renders this petition premature and non-maintainable. The constitutional jurisdiction of this Court is not an omnibus forum for ventilating every grievance. It is a forum of last resort, invoked only when no other efficacious remedy exists and when fundamental rights are demonstrably violated.

6. The petitioner's allegations, though serious, pertain to administrative irregularities and financial mismanagement. These are matters best investigated by the Anti-Corruption Establishment or the Local Government Board under the statutory scheme.

7. The petitioner, being part of the same governance structure, cannot seek constitutional relief against his colleagues. The Court cannot be transformed into a supervisory authority over every Union Council in the province. To do so would be to trespass into the domain of executive oversight, which is constitutionally impermissible.

8. In view of the foregoing, this petition is **dismissed** for being not maintainable under Article 199 of the Constitution. However, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the competent authorities under the Sindh Local Government Act, 2013, including the Local Government Board, for redressal of his grievances.

Let a copy of this order be sent to the Secretary, Local Government Department, Government of Sindh, for information and appropriate action, if deemed necessary.

**Judge**

**Judge**

*Manzoor*