

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

***Constitution Petition No. D-1244 of 2019.
(Dr. Naila Parveen vs Province of Sindh and others)***

***For Orders on CMA 7692/2025 (Ex.A)
For hearing of CMA No.7693/2025 (Contempt Application)***

12.05.2026

Mr. Sarfraz A. Akhund, Advocate for Applicant in above cited CMAs / Respondent No.8.

Mr. Sheeraz Fazal, Advocate for Respondents/ Contemnors No.1 to 3 along with Muhammad Hassan Halepoto, Registrar, Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur.

Contemnor No.4/ Petitioner Dr. Naila Parveen present in person.

Mr. Ali Raza Balouch, Additional Advocate General.

The record reflects that the captioned petition was disposed of vide order dated 02.03.2023, whereby directions were issued to the Respondents to constitute a committee to determine the matter relating to the appointment and promotion of the Petitioner as well as Respondent No. 8. Pursuant thereto, compliance was reportedly made. However, the Petitioner subsequently filed a contempt application, bearing CMA No. 290/2024, which was disposed of on 24.09.2025. While disposing of the said application, this Court observed that if any party was aggrieved by the inquiry report, they were at liberty to initiate appropriate proceedings before the competent forum in accordance with law.

Thereafter, Respondent No. 8 preferred contempt application, being CMA No. 7693/2025, alleging disobedience of the Court's orders and contending that the Petitioner continues to enjoy interim relief.

It is manifest from the order dated 24.09.2025 that any party aggrieved by the inquiry report was required to seek redress through independent proceedings before the

appropriate forum. In fact, the Petitioner has already availed such remedy by instituting separate proceedings through C.P. No. D-69/2024. Whilst, if Respondent No. 8 is aggrieved by any act of the University-respondents and considers the same to be in deviation of the order dated 24.09.2025, it is already evident from the said order that any aggrieved party may initiate separate proceedings before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

In view of the above position, the instant contempt application filed by Respondent No. 8 is not maintainable. Accordingly, the same, along with the listed application, is hereby dismissed.

JUDGE

JUDGE