

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

C.P. No.D-452 of 2026

[Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others]

Before:

Mr. Justice Arbab Ali Hakro

Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar

1. For order on MA No.1829/2026.
2. For order on office objection.
3. For order on MA No.1830/2026.
4. For order on MA No.1831/2026.
5. For hearing of main case.

Petitioner : Waqar Baig through Mr. Rashid
Raees, Advocate.

Respondents : Nil.

Date of Hearing : **05.03.2026**

Date of Decision : **05.03.2026**

ORDER

RIAZAT ALI SAHAR. J. - Through this petition, the petitioner are seeking following reliefs:-

- a) *This Honorable Court may kindly be pleased to direct the Respondent No. 7 to 11 and 14 that they will not remove the Petitioner from his service.*
- b) *This Honorable Court may also kindly be pleased to suspend the operations of order of Enquiry, charge sheet, Statement of allegations and the process of Medical Board being all tactics for remove from service by Respondent No. 7 to 11 and 14.*
- c) *This Honorable Court may also kindly be pleased to suspend the order dated. 24.12.2020 passed by Ex-Chairman EOBI being time barred same is 5 years old.*
- d) *That this Honorable Court may also kindly be direct the Respondent No. 7 to 11 that he shall promote the Petitioner at the post of Assistant Director due to he served 30 years in the department of EOBI so he deserve of this Post. The Respondent No. 8 to 10 and 12 has promoted 2 to 6 times in their services. So, Petitioner has deserved this stage.*
- e) *This Honorable Court also may kindly be pleased to direct the Respondent No. 16 that he shall constitute the Enquiry*

Commission about the service of the Petitioner of his service of 30 years.

- f) This Honorable Court also may kindly be pleased to direct the Respondent No. 1 to 7 to arrange meeting with the Petitioner for resolve the all issues and take action against Respondent No. 8 to 10 due to these have disturb the Petitioner for remove from his service.*
- g) This Honorable Court may issue direction to the Respondent No. 11, 12 and 13 that they will not part of medical board and not take coercive action against the Petitioner.*
- h) This Honorable Court may also kindly be pleased to restrain the functionaries of Respondent No. 14 due to he is also working for remove from his service of the Petitioner.*
- i) This Honorable Court may also kindly be pleased to direct the Respondent No. 16 to 17 that they will take action against Respondent No. 15 after calling of his service record and record the statement of Petitioner.*
- j) This Honorable Court may also kindly be pleased to direct the Respondent No. 16 and 18 that he shall conduct inquiry about the corruption of the EOBI department all over to Pakistan level including Kotri and Hyderabad with checking of the bank balances and properties etc.*
- k) Any other relief which this Honorable Court may deems fit and proper according to the facts of the petition may also be awarded to the Petitioner.*

2. In the instant Constitution Petition filed under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, the petitioner has stated that **he is an employee of the Employees' Old-Age Benefits Institution (EOBI)**, where according to him, he has served for approximately thirty years. **According to the petitioner, throughout his service he remained honest and did not participate in alleged corrupt practices prevailing within the department.** He stated that because of his refusal to become part of such alleged activities, certain officers of EOBI, particularly those posted at Kotri and Hyderabad, developed hostility towards him and continuously subjected him to harassment and victimization. It is the stance of the petitioner that despite serving the institution for a considerable period, he was allegedly not assigned meaningful work by successive regional heads posted at Kotri and Hyderabad. He stated that he was deliberately kept away from computer-related duties and other office responsibilities in order to prevent him from exposing

alleged irregularities and corruption within the department. According to him, this treatment persisted throughout his service and the higher authorities of the department failed to intervene. The petitioner further stated that the management of EOBI at different levels, including senior officers at the headquarters, supported the regional administration and did not entertain his grievances. He stated that reports concerning his conduct and performance were allegedly prepared and transmitted to higher authorities without being shared with him, thereby depriving him of an opportunity to respond. According to the petitioner, this conduct violated the principles of fairness and transparency.

3. The petitioner also stated that corruption exists in various regional offices of EOBI across the country, including the offices at Kotri and Hyderabad. He alleged that certain field officers and regional heads have been involved in practices whereby employers are shown to have fewer workers than actually employed, resulting in reduced contributions to the EOBI fund and consequently causing financial loss to the institution and prejudice to workers entitled to benefits under the EOBI scheme. **However, the petitioner has not provided any documentary evidence in support of these allegations except making general assertions in this regard.** It is further stated that the petitioner raised these concerns before various authorities including the Chairman EOBI, the Secretary Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development and other senior officials, but according to him no meaningful action was taken on his representations. He also claimed that despite the passage of several years he was not granted any promotion, whereas other officers were allegedly promoted multiple times during their service.

4. The petitioner stated that at one stage he was subjected to disciplinary proceedings and remained out of service for a period of about fourteen months before his restoration. According to him, his restoration was delayed deliberately and certain undertakings were obtained from him under alleged coercion. He contends that such actions were taken in retaliation for his complaints regarding corruption in the department. The petitioner further submitted that **after a lapse of several years the management of EOBI decided to constitute a medical board for his examination.** According to the petitioner,

the constitution of such medical board is arbitrary, *mala fide* and time-barred, as he claims to be physically and mentally fit for performing his duties. He alleged that the said step has been initiated by certain officers of the Human Resource Department with the ulterior motive of harassing him and ultimately removing him from service.

5. **The record reflects that the petitioner addressed several applications and representations to various authorities including the Prime Minister's Office, the President's Secretariat, the Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resource Development, the Chairman EOBI and other officials.** Through these communications he sought intervention, requested constitution of an inquiry commission to investigate alleged corruption in EOBI and prayed for personal meetings with high-ranking authorities to present his grievances. **The petitioner also served legal notices upon certain officials of EOBI and requested that the process relating to the medical board be suspended and that an inquiry be conducted through the Federal Investigation Agency into the alleged corruption within the department as well as into the promotion and administrative matters of various officers.** According to the petitioner, despite submission of numerous applications and representations, he did not receive any satisfactory response from the concerned authorities. He therefore approached this Court by filing the present constitutional petition under Article 199 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, seeking directions against the respondents to address his grievances, suspend the constitution of the medical board, initiate an inquiry into alleged corruption within EOBI and grant him appropriate relief including restoration of his service rights and fair treatment within the department.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been subjected to continuous harassment by the management of EOBI solely because he refused to participate in corrupt practices allegedly prevailing within the department. He contended that despite rendering nearly three decades of service, the petitioner has not been granted promotion and has been deliberately sidelined by departmental authorities. Learned counsel further contended that the constitution of a medical board after several years is *mala fide* and

intended to victimize the petitioner and remove him from service on baseless grounds.

7. During the course of hearing, the Court queried learned counsel for the petitioner to point out any statutory provision or legal right under which the petitioner could seek the reliefs claimed in the present petition, particularly the direction for constitution of an inquiry commission into the entire affairs of EOBI and intervention in internal administrative matters of the department. The Court also asked whether any specific order adversely affecting the legal rights of the petitioner had been challenged before this Court. In response, learned counsel could not refer to any specific statutory violation or impugned order amenable to constitutional jurisdiction, nor was he able to produce any documentary material substantiating the sweeping allegations of corruption made in the petition. The replies offered remained general and unsubstantiated and did not satisfactorily address the Court's queries regarding maintainability of the petition.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material available on record, it appears that the present petition primarily contains generalized allegations against various officers of EOBI and other government authorities without any concrete evidence or specific cause of action warranting interference by this Court in exercise of its constitutional jurisdiction.

9. It is well settled that jurisdiction under Article 199 of the Constitution is discretionary and can only be exercised where a clear violation of law or infringement of a fundamental right is demonstrated. **The constitutional jurisdiction is not meant to serve as a forum for entertaining vague allegations or for initiating roving inquiries into administrative affairs of government departments in the absence of cogent material.**

10. In the present case, the petitioner has levelled serious allegations of corruption against numerous officers of EOBI and other authorities; however, these allegations are largely based on personal perceptions and have not been substantiated by any documentary

evidence. **The petitioner has also sought directions for constitution of an inquiry commission into the entire affairs of the department**, which clearly falls outside the scope of the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court. Furthermore, **the petitioner has not challenged any specific order passed by the competent authority which could be examined by this Court on judicial review**. The grievances raised by the petitioner primarily relate to **service matters**, alleged non-promotion, administrative decisions and internal functioning of the department, for which appropriate remedies are available under the relevant service laws and departmental mechanisms. It is also noteworthy that the petitioner has addressed numerous representations and communications to various authorities including the Prime Minister's Office, the President's Secretariat and other departments. The mere fact that the petitioner did not receive a response to his satisfaction does not by itself create a cause of action for invoking constitutional jurisdiction.

11. We have further taken note of the fact that the petitioner Waqar Baig being employee of EOBI has previously filed multiple petitions and criminal miscellaneous applications before this Court in person raising similar grievances against officers of EOBI and other authorities. The available record indicates that the petitioner has filed as many as **40** constitutional petitions and criminal miscellaneous applications including instant petition from time to time against various officials of the institution and government departments. The details of the petitions is as under:-

| SR. NO. | CASE WITH NUMBER AND YEAR | CASE TITLE |
|---------|---------------------------|---|
| 1. | C.P. No.D-2048/2012 | Waqar Baig v. Javed Iqbal |
| 2. | C.P. No.D-2058/2012 | Waqar Baig v. Javeed Iqbal & others |
| 3. | C.P. No.D-2239/2012 | Waqar Baig v. Jwed Iqbal & others |
| 4. | C.P. No.D-2400/2012 | Waqar Baig v. Fed Minister & others |
| 5. | C.P. No.D-2422/2012 | Waqar Baig v. C. Wajahat Hussain |
| 6. | C.P. No.D-2082/2013 | Waqar Baig v. Secretary Ministry of HRD & others. |
| 7. | C.P. No.D-563/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others |
| 8. | C.P. No.D-1229/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 9. | C.P. No.D-1397/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 10. | C.P. No.D-1930/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Govt. of Sindh & others |
| 11. | C.P. No.D-2146/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 12. | C.P. No.D-2308/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 13. | C.P. No.D-242/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Chairman EOBI & others. |
| 14. | C.P. No.D-789/2014 | Waqar Baig v. Ld SJ Jamshoro & others |
| 15. | C.P. No.D-467/2015 | Waqar Baig v. P.O. Sindh & others |
| 16. | C.P. No.D-537/2015 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 17. | C.P. No.D-542/2015 | Waqar Baig v. P.O. Sindh & others. |

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|
| 18. | C.P. No.D-100/2016 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others |
| 19. | C.P. No.D-3093/2016 | Waqar Baig v. Chairman EOBI & others |
| 20. | C.P. No.D-834/2017 | Waqar Baig v. Abdul Wahid & others |
| 21. | C.P. No.D-2485/2017 | Waqar Baig v. Abdul Wahid & others. |
| 22. | C.P. No.D-450/2017 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 23. | C.P. No.D-1116/2018 | Waqar Baig v. Chairman EOBI & others |
| 24. | C.P. No.D-1534/2018 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 25. | C.P. No.D-2503/2018 | Waqar Baig v. P.O. Sindh & others. |
| 26. | C.P. No.D-2508/2018 | Waqar Baig v. P.O. Sindh & others. |
| 27. | C.P. No.D-2934/2018 | Waqar Baig v. Chairman EOBI & others |
| 28. | C.P. No.D-3117/2018 | Waqar Baig v. P.O. Sindh & others. |
| 29. | C.P. No.D-3118/2018 | Waqar Baig v. P.O. Sindh & others |
| 30. | C.P. No.D-590/2018 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 31. | C.P. No.D-953/2018 | Waqar Baig v. Chairman EOBI & others |
| 32. | C.P. No.D-1798/2019 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 33. | C.P. No.D-2106/2019 | Waqar Baig v. P.O. Sindh & others. |
| 34. | C.P. No.D-2554/2019 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others. |
| 35. | Cr.Mis.No.S-287/2017 | Waqar Baig v. Abdul Wahid & others. |
| 36. | Cr.Mis.No.S-350/2019 | Waqar Baig v. Zulfiqar Ali & others. |
| 37. | Cr.Mis.No.S-313/2022 | Waqar Baig v. S.P. Complaint Cell Hyder & others. |
| 38. | C.P. No.D-1670/2022 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others |
| 39. | C.P. No.D-1750/2022 | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others |
| 40. | C.P. No.D-452/2026 [present] | Waqar Baig v. Federation of Pakistan & others |

Such repeated litigation on substantially similar allegations suggests a pattern whereby the petitioner appears to be habitually invoking judicial proceedings against departmental officers etc. without placing sufficient material on record. Courts of law cannot be used as forums for pursuing personal grievances through unsubstantiated allegations against public functionaries.

12. The petitioner’s attempt to portray himself as the sole and last honest officer in the entire department amounts to self-exposure and self-praise (“Khud Sunai”), which in itself reflects a weakness on the part of the petitioner and is contrary to the principles of Islamic Jurisprudence that discourage self-glorification.

13. The pivotal question which arises for consideration of this Court is whether the petitioner is attending his office and discharging of his official duties regularly, as he appears to be spending considerable time in this Court to pursue the numerous matters filed by him (supra), report be called from Chairman EOBI, Karachi through the Additional Registrar of this Court, which shall be placed in chamber.

14. For what has been discussed above, we are of the considered opinion that the present petition is devoid of merit, lacks

corroboration and does not disclose any enforceable legal right requiring interference by this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution. Consequently, the petition is **dismissed** in *limine* along with listed applications.

15. Let a copy of this order be communicated to Chairman EOBI, Karachi for information and compliance.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Abdullahchanna/PS