

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI
C.P. No. D-3744 of 2022
(Ejaz Khan v. The Province of Sindh and others)

Date	Order with signature of Judge
------	-------------------------------

Before:-
Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon
Mr. Justice Muhammad Jaffer Raza

Date of hearing & order: 24.8.2026

Mr. Muhammad Aziz, Advocate for the petitioner.
M/s. Amanullah Qazi, Akbar Lashari, Humaira Jatoi, Advocates for SBCA.
Mr. Sarwar Khalid Soomro, Sindh Master Plan Authority
Mr. Abdul Jalil Zubedi, AAG.

ORDER

Adnan-ul-Karim Memon, J. Petitioner has filed this constitutional petition seeking a declaration that the acts of the respondents to keep the approval of the proposed construction plan in respect of property bearing Survey No. 498 admeasuring 4-16 acres Ahsanabad Housing Project Survey No. 498, Deh Drigh Malir Shah Faisal Town, Karachi measuring 1717 sq. yards for indefinite period is illegal and unlawful and seeking directions for approval in accordance with law. Petitioner is also seeking protection from any adverse action.

2. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner has put in appearance and submits that he does not wish to press the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for SBCA submitted that the subject matter concerns property bearing Survey No. 498, admeasuring 4-16 Acres, situated in Ahsanabad Housing Project, Deh Drigh, Malir, Shah Faisal, Karachi. Pursuant to the directions of this Honourable Court, the Authority conducted a site inspection and found the plot lying vacant, except for a boundary wall and one gate. No society's signboard or advertisement was displayed, no construction activity was observed, and no construction permit for the subject plot has been approved or issued by the Authority. Learned counsel representing the SBCA states that matter has been settled, therefore, no action is required in this regard. This is the reason that petitioner does not want to press this petition.

4. In view of the above, this petition has effectively become infructuous because the grievance regarding approval of the proposed construction plan has been resolved.

5. The SBCA, pursuant to the Court's directions, conducted a site inspection and confirmed that the plot was vacant except for a boundary wall and gate, with no construction activity, advertisement, or approved construction permit.

6. Since the petitioner's counsel voluntarily stated that he did not wish to press the petition, therefore, this Court is left with no option but to dismiss this petition as not pressed, without adjudicating the merits of the petitioner's claim.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Aadil Arab