

Order Sheet

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH,**  
**CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD**

CP No. D- 2726 of 2022

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

18.11.2025

For orders on office objections  
For orders on MA 10585/22  
For hearing of main case

Petitioner present in person  
Mr. Rafiq Ahmed Dahri, Asstt: A.G.

The petitioners have challenged the judgment dated 22.04.2022 passed by the Sindh Labour Appellate Tribunal, Karachi in Appeal No. KAR-277/2021, whereby their appeal was dismissed and the judgment dated 08.11.2021 of the Sindh Labour Court No. V, Karachi was upheld.

2. Briefly, petitioner No.1 was employed as a Driver and petitioner No.2, his wife, as a Dai/Aya with PPHI on daily wages. Petitioner No.1 was terminated on 19.10.2015 on allegations of sexual harassment of a Lady Health Visitor, while petitioner No.2 claims she was compelled to resign due to pressure arising from her husband’s termination. Their earlier petition (C.P. No. D-1981/2017) was disposed of with directions to approach the Grievance Committee, which on 25.08.2017 upheld their termination. The petitioners thereafter filed a Grievance Application seeking reinstatement, which was dismissed by the Labour Court as time-barred, and their subsequent appeal was also dismissed.

3. The petitioners submit that they had shown sufficient cause for condonation of delay, that their termination was unlawful and without due process, and that the courts below failed to consider the material facts. They further claim that petitioner No.2’s resignation was forced and petitioner No.1 was denied an opportunity of hearing.

4. This Court, vide order dated 13.10.2022, sought clarification on whether petitioner No.1 was terminated solely on allegations of harassment and whether petitioner No.2 had voluntarily resigned.

5. The learned A.A.G. contends that there are concurrent findings of facts by both courts below; petitioner No.1 was terminated on allegations of harassment and petitioner No.2 voluntarily resigned, therefore no interference is warranted.

6. After hearing the parties, it appears that both courts below have provided valid and well-reasoned grounds for dismissing the petitioners' claims. Petitioner No.2's resignation was accepted by the competent authority and cannot be recalled in constitutional jurisdiction. As for petitioner No.1, the concurrent findings regarding the allegations and termination cannot be disturbed under Article 199 of the Constitution. The petition, being directed against concurrent findings and suffering from laches, is liable to be dismissed.

7. For the foregoing reasons, the petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed as not maintainable.

JUDGE

JUDGE

karar\_hussain/PS\*