

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Constitutional Petition No.D-377 of 2026
(Shahzad Ameen v. Province of Sindh and others)

<i>Date of Hearing</i>	<i>Order with the signature of Judge.</i>
------------------------	---

Before:-
Mr. Justice Amjad Ali Bohio,
Mr. Justice Ali Haider 'Ada'.

05.03.2026.

Mr. Alam Sher Khan Bozdar, Advocate for the Petitioner

Ali Haider 'Ada' J- The grievance of the petitioner is that the revenue hierarchy be directed to correct the village map and declare the boundaries thereof. It is contended that the petitioner had earlier moved an application before the Director, Goth Abad Scheme, Hyderabad; however, the said application has not yet been decided. On such a premise, the petitioner has invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court through the instant petition.

2. It appears from the record that the Revenue Department, Government of Sindh, through Notification No. DD (E&I) / HQ / BOR / 2024 / 302 dated 21.10.2024, has established a Public Grievance Redressal Cell for addressing revenue-related matters through a one-window facility. Under the said mechanism, complaints pertaining to mutation entries, sale certificates, Foti Khata / Badal, demarcation of land, partition of land, solvency certificates and other allied matters are required to be recorded in a complaint register and disposed of on an expedited basis. The Deputy Commissioner of the concerned district has been designated as the Principal Officer for Public Grievance Redressal and the entire mechanism functions under his supervision.

3. During the course of examination of the material placed on record, it further transpired that the Section Officer-II, Services, General Administration and Coordination Department, Government of Sindh, addressed a letter to the Commissioner, Sukkur Division, as well as the Deputy Commissioner, Ghotki, directing them to redress the grievance of the petitioner. Pursuant thereto, a report was submitted by the Assistant Commissioner concerned. In the concluding portion of the said report, it was observed that the original structure of the land as reflected in the Goth Abad Scheme map be restored. It is significant to note that such a conclusion was arrived at with the consent of the parties concerned, including the present petitioner.

4. In such circumstances, if the petitioner is aggrieved by the findings or the conclusion so recorded by the revenue authorities, the proper course available to him is to approach the competent forum within the revenue hierarchy in accordance with the provisions of the Sindh Land Revenue Act. Instead of availing the remedy provided under the relevant revenue laws, the petitioner has directly approached this Court through the present constitutional petition.

5. It is well settled that the Constitutional jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 199 of the Constitution is not intended to serve as a substitute for statutory remedies, nor does this Court sit as an appellate authority over the decisions of the executive or revenue functionaries where a specific mechanism has already been provided under the law. Moreover, the controversy involved in the present case essentially relates to questions of fact, including the determination of boundaries and correction of village maps, which ordinarily require examination of the record and, if necessary, recording of evidence. Such factual controversies cannot conveniently be adjudicated in the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court. In this regard, reference may be made to the principles laid down by the Honourable Supreme Court of Pakistan in the cases of *Special Secretary-II (Law and Order), Home and Tribal Affairs Department, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar and others v. Fayyaz Dawar* (2023 SCMR 1442), *Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa through Chief Secretary, Peshawar and others v. Intizar*

Ali and others (2022 SCMR 472), Province of Punjab through Secretary Communication and Works Department, Lahore through Chief Engineer (North/Central), Punjab Highway Department, Lahore v. Yasir Majeed Sheikh and others (2021 SCMR 624) and Messrs Fateh Yarn (Pvt.) Ltd., Faisalabad v. Commissioner Inland Revenue, Faisalabad and others (2021 SCMR 1133), wherein it has consistently been held that disputes involving factual controversies and matters requiring recording of evidence cannot appropriately be resolved in the constitutional jurisdiction of the High Court.

6. For the foregoing reasons, this Court is not inclined to exercise its constitutional jurisdiction in the present matter. Consequently, the instant petition is dismissed.

JUDGE

JUDGE