

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

C. P. No. D – 721 of 2026

[Sadaqat Ali and others v. Province of Sindh and others]

Before:
Justice Arbab Ali Hakro
Justice Muhammad Osman Ali Hadi

Petitioner by : Mr. Ghulam Muhammad, Associate of Mr. Sikandar Ali Junejo, Advocate

Respondents by : Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Naich, Assistant Advocate General Sindh along with Tanveer Ahmed, Additional Deputy Commissioner-I, Sukkur and Ghulam Murtaza Shah, District Education Officer (E,S&HS), Sukkur

Date of Hearing : **02.09.2026**

Date of Decision : **02.09.2026**

ORDER

ARBAB ALI HAKRO, J. – Through this petition filed under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, the petitioners seek directions against the respondents to issue offer or appointment orders in their favour for non-technical posts in BPS-01 to BPS-04. The petitioners claim that they participated in the walk-in interview/recruitment process, were declared successful, and that their names were included in a recommendation list allegedly issued by the District Recruitment Committee (DRC) vide letter No. DEO/ES&HS/REC/-03 of 2023 dated 27.07.2023.

2. The brief facts, as borne out by the record, are that, according to the petitioners, a meeting of the recruitment/selection committee was held on 06.06.2023 under the chairmanship of the Deputy Commissioner, Sukkur, and the petitioners participated in the walk-in interview for non-technical posts from BPS-01 to BPS-04. It is their case that thereafter a recommendation list of successful candidates was issued by the District Education Officer (Elementary, Secondary & Higher Secondary), Sukkur, purportedly vide letter No. DEO/ES&HS/REC/-03 of 2023 dated 27.07.2023. The petitioners assert that their names appeared in the said list at different serial numbers for the posts of Naib Qasid and Watchman/Cum Chowkidar

(BPS-01), but despite repeated approaches to the respondents, no offer or appointment orders were issued in their favour.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been declared successful by the competent recruitment committee and that their names have been duly reflected in the recommendation list. He submits that, despite issuing offer or appointment orders to other similarly placed candidates, the respondents have arbitrarily and discriminatorily withheld the petitioners' orders. It is further contended that the petitioners have a legitimate claim to be treated in accordance with the recommendation list and that the respondents may be directed to produce the original record of the recruitment process.

4. On the other hand, the respondents have taken a categorical stance that no such recruitment proceedings for non-technical posts in BPS-01 to BPS-04 were conducted by the office of the District Education Officer (Elementary, Secondary & Higher Secondary), Sukkur, during the year 2023. It is specifically asserted that the alleged DRC letter bearing No. DEO/ES&HS/REC/-03 of 2023, dated 27.07.2023, was never issued, authenticated or endorsed by the office of respondent No.05. The respondents have placed on record the relevant outward register and a Memorandum/Awareness Notification bearing No. DEO/ES&HS/LTG/410/2026, dated 09.04.2026, which informed the general public that no such recruitment/appointment process had been approved or authorized.

5. Learned AAG Sindh further submits that the document relied upon by the petitioners has been circulated through social media and unofficial channels, and that it is forged and fabricated. It is contended that the official outward record does not disclose the issuance of the alleged DRC letter. It has also been pointed out that several other constitutional petitions have been instituted before this Court on the basis of the same purported DRC, including C. P. Nos. D-662/2026, D-707/2026, D-1113/2026, D-799/2026 and D-894/2026.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and examined the material on record.

7. The record placed before us reveals a serious divergence between the version of the petitioners and that of the official respondents. The petitioners predicate their entire claim on the alleged DRC letter dated 27.07.2023 and the recommendation list stated to have been issued thereunder. Conversely, the official respondents have categorically denied issuing the said document and have produced the relevant official record in support of their stance. The respondents further assert that no recruitment process for the posts in question was conducted by the concerned office during the relevant period.

8. The controversy, therefore, is not merely confined to the petitioners' entitlement to appointment. The very existence and authenticity of the recruitment process and the document upon which the petitioners base their claim are seriously disputed. The questions whether the alleged DRC letter was genuinely issued by the competent authority, whether the names of the petitioners were actually recommended by a duly constituted recruitment committee, whether the recommendation list forms part of the official record, and whether any manipulation or fabrication has occurred, require examination of the original administrative record.

9. It is also significant that the respondents have relied specifically on the outward register of the concerned office and have stated that no letter bearing the alleged number and date was issued from that office. At the same time, the petitioners maintain that the document is genuine and that they were duly selected. Such conflicting factual assertions cannot, in the circumstances of the present case, be conclusively adjudicated merely on the basis of the photocopies/documents presently before this Court in exercise of constitutional jurisdiction.

10. The allegations raised before us are of a serious nature. If the document relied upon by the petitioners is genuine and was in fact issued by the competent authority, the matter would require appropriate action by the respondents in accordance with law. Conversely, if the document is found to be forged or fabricated and has been used to secure an appointment or to invoke the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court, the matter would equally require appropriate action in accordance with law. The integrity of the public

recruitment process and the authenticity of official documents cannot be compromised.

11. In these circumstances, particularly in view of the conflicting claims regarding the alleged DRC proceedings, the recommendation list, the outward number and the official dispatch record, we are of the view that the matter requires a neutral and competent administrative inquiry before any direction for appointment can appropriately be issued.

12. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of, with directions to the Chief Secretary, Government of Sindh, to constitute a high-level inquiry committee, headed by a senior officer not below BPS-20, preferably from the Services, General Administration & Coordination Department, to examine the entire controversy relating to the alleged recruitment process for non-technical posts (BPS-01 to BPS-04) in District Sukkur, and, in particular, the alleged proceedings of the District Recruitment Committee in 2023. The committee shall scrutinize the alleged DRC letter bearing No. DEO/ES&HS/REC/-03 of 2023, dated 27.07.2023; the original outward and dispatch registers; the DRC proceedings/minutes; the recommendation lists; the attendance/ interview record; the sanctioned vacancies; the recruitment policy/SOPs; and all other connected documents. It shall determine whether the said DRC letter was genuinely issued by the competent authority, whether the petitioners participated in the alleged recruitment process and were duly recommended by a lawfully constituted committee, and whether any manipulation, fabrication, unauthorized issuance, or tampering with the official record has occurred.

13. The committee shall also, to the extent necessary, examine the recruitment or appointment of other candidates allegedly selected under the same recruitment process and determine whether any person has been appointed on the basis of the disputed document or purported DRC proceedings. The petitioners shall be at liberty to place their entire material before the inquiry committee, while the concerned respondents shall produce the complete original official record. If any document is found to have been forged, fabricated or manipulated, the competent authority shall take appropriate action strictly in accordance with law. The inquiry shall be

concluded within sixty (60) days of receipt of this order, and appropriate consequential action shall thereafter be taken strictly in accordance with law.

14. It is clarified that nothing contained in this order shall be construed as a finding that the document relied upon by the petitioners is genuine or fabricated. The question of its authenticity, as well as the legality of the alleged recruitment process, shall be determined by the inquiry committee on the basis of the original record, after affording the concerned parties due opportunity of hearing.

With these observations, the petition is **disposed of**, along with any pending application(s).

J U D G E

J U D G E

Abdul Basit