IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Civil Revision Application No. 102 of 2026

[*National Bank of Pakistan and another v. Mena Energy DMCC and another*]

And

Civil Revision Application No. 197 of 2026

[*Habib Metro Bank Limited v. Mena Energy DMCC and another*]

****

Applicant No. 1 in C.R.A No. 102 of 2026 and for Applicant in C.R.A. No. 197 of 2026	:	Through Mr. Mohsin Shahwani, Advocate
Applicant No. 2 in C.R.A No. 102 of 2026	:	Through Mr. Hassan Ali, Advocate
Respondent No. 1 in both Revisions	:	Through Mr. Ijaz Ahmed, Advocate along with Mr. Hashmatullah Aleem, Advocate
Respondent No. 2 in both Revisions	:	Exparte
Date of Hearing	:	25.09.2026

****

J U D G M E N T

SAMAN RAFAT IMTIAZ, J.- Through this consolidated judgment, I intend to decide Civil Revision Application No.102 of 2026 filed by the Applicants [National Bank of Pakistan **("NBP")** and Habib Bank Limited **("HBL")**] and Civil Revision Application No.197 of 2026 filed by the Applicant [Habib Metro Bank Limited **("HMBL")**] under Section 115, CPC to challenge the Order dated 17.04.2026 **("Impugned Order")** passed by the learned XIIth Additional District & Sessions Judge, Karachi South in New Execution No. 23 of 2025.

2. The Respondent No. 1 [Mena Energy DMCC] is a company incorporated in Dubai, United Arab Emirates while the Respondent No. 2 [Hascol Petroleum Limited] is a public limited company incorporated in Pakistan. The litigation began with a judgment dated 15.06.2018 passed by consent in Case No. CL-2015-000620 by the High Court of Justice, Business & Property Courts of England and Wales, Commercial Court (QBD) **("Foreign Judgment")** whereby the Respondent No. 2 was ordered to pay US$9,500,000/- to the Respondent No. 1 forthwith. The Foreign Judgment was passed in terms of a Settlement Agreement dated 19.01.2018 between the Respondents No. 1 and 2. To enforce the Foreign

Judgment, the Respondent No. 1 filed Execution No. 51 of 2019 under Section 44-A CPC before this Court in its original civil jurisdiction.

3. By order dated 12.10.2021, a learned Single Judge of this Court held that the Foreign Judgment is conclusive between the parties within the meaning of Section 13, CPC and is executable under Section 44-A CPC. The objections of the Respondent No. 2 were dismissed and the execution was allowed. Among other directions, the Respondent No. 2 was restrained from dealing with the credit balances of its bank accounts. As reproduced in the Impugned Order, the operative part of the order dated 12.10.2021 reads as follows:

> *"The JD is prohibited from withdrawing or transferring the credit balance of its bank account maintained with the banks listed in CMA No. 300/2019, the details of which are in appendix 'A' to this order (filed by JD) and said banks are restrained accordingly."*

4. The Respondent No. 2 challenged the order dated 12.10.2021 by filing High Court Appeal No. 186 of 2021. On 15.10.2021, a Division Bench of this Court issued notice of the appeal. The Respondent No. 2 had complained that its entire movable and immovable assets were attached, and that it was also restrained from operating its bank accounts, which would push the company towards liquidation. The Division Bench directed the Respondent No. 2 to furnish the title documents of Plot Nos. B-26 and B-27, measuring 8.7 acres, situated at North Western Industrial Zone, Port Qasim Authority, Bin Qasim, Karachi before the Nazir of this Court as security. It was further ordered that subject to furnishing of those documents, the operation of the order dated 12.10.2021, to the extent of attachment of the bank accounts of the Respondent No. 2, shall remain suspended. However, the bank accounts were to be used only for carrying on the day-to-day business affairs of the company, including payment of salaries to employees and meeting statutory legal obligations, until further orders in that appeal.

5. High Court Appeal No. 186 of 2021 was finally disposed of vide order dated 08.11.2022 passed by consent. The Division Bench directed all the parties to appear before the learned Single Judge and to file appropriate applications in Execution No. 51 of 2019, seeking recall or modification of the order dated 12.10.2021, as may be permissible under the law, within seven days from the date of the order. On the point which is central to the present applications, the Division Bench ordered as follows:

> ***"However, in the meanwhile the interim order passed on 15.10.2021** in the instant High Court Appeal, to the extent of operation of the bank accounts of the appellant i.e. 'However, such bank accounts shall only be utilized for the purposes carrying on day to day business*

> *affairs of the company, including disbursement of the salaries to its employees and to meet statutory legal obligations',* ***shall remain operative however, it will be subject to further orders, as may be passed by the learned Executing Court to this effect in accordance with law."*** [Emphasis added].

6. Objections were filed in the execution proceedings by different banks. The objections of the Applicants/NBP & HMBL bearing CMA No. 409 of 2021, seeking detachment of the bank accounts of the Respondent No. 2, were dismissed by order dated 06.09.2023. The Applicants/NBP then filed High Court Appeal No. 419 of 2023 against that order, which is stated to be pending before a Division Bench of this Court. The objections of certain other banks were dismissed by order dated 27.02.2025.

7. Meanwhile, the original civil jurisdiction of this Court was taken away. While deciding the forum for the execution proceedings, the learned Single Judge of this Court in Execution No. 51 of 2019 passed an order dated 27.10.2025, in which it was observed that the order dated 12.10.2021 was never suspended in appeal and that the directions passed on that date have not been modified, as all applications presented by various banks in the execution application had been dismissed. The execution proceedings were thereafter transferred to the Court of the learned XIIth Additional District Judge, Karachi South and were registered as New Execution No. 23 of 2025.

8. On 17.04.2026, the matter was fixed for hearing of the Respondent No. 2 and further compliance before the Executing Court. The learned counsel for the Respondent No. 2 submitted that on the last date of hearing, the Executing Court passed an Order whereby properties bearing Nos. B-26 and B-27 were attached and the Nazir of the Court was directed to initiate auction proceedings. He further submitted that the operation of the order dated 12-10-2021 to the extent of attachment of bank accounts was suspended by the Hon'ble High Court of Sindh. By the Impugned Order dated 17.04.2026, the learned Executing Court held that the Order dated 12.10.2021 regarding attachment of Respondent No.2's bank accounts remained operative and directed the concerned banks to submit compliance reports. The Applicant Banks/ have challenged the order through the instant Civil Revision Applications, contending that the Division Bench orders dated 15.10.2021 and 08.11.2022 had suspended/modified the attachment to the extent of permitting Respondent No.2 to operate its accounts for specified purposes. They further contend that the impugned order misreads the said orders and adversely affects their banking facilities and financial interests.

9. The learned counsel for the Applicants/NBP & HMBL has referred to orders dated 12.10.2021, 15.10.2021, 08.11.2022 and 27.10.2025 to submit that the Impugned Order has misinterpreted the aforementioned orders and submits that there was no attachment order enshrined in Order dated 12.10.2021 to begin with but even otherwise the attachment, if any, was suspended vide Order dated 15.10.2021 which was an interim order passed in an appeal against the Order dated 12.10.2021 and the said Order dated 15.10.2021 was continued by way of the final disposal Order dated 08.11.2022.

10. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Respondent No.1 explained that the Order dated 12-10-2021 was passed by this Court in Execution No. 51 of 2019 whereby, inter alia, the Respondent No. 2/Judgment Debtor was prohibited from withdrawing or transferring the credit balances of its bank accounts maintained with the banks listed in CMA 300/2019 and the said banks were restrained accordingly and it was ordered that the above order of attachment of movables shall be transmitted to the banks. He highlighted the last paragraph of order dated 12.10.2021 which states that the attachment of movables shall be transmitted by the office to the companies in the banks to argue that the said order very much envisages attachment of the bank accounts.

11. The learned counsel for the Respondent No.1 drew the Court's attention to facility letter dated 21.05.2026 granted by the Applicant/HMBL whereby facilities were granted by the Applicant/HMBL to the Respondent No.2 as well as the guarantee issued by the Respondent No.2 in favour of the said Applicant which was dated 19.05.2026 to highlight that the Impugned Order was already in the field when the Applicant/HMBL chose to grant finance facilities knowingly to the Respondent No.2 and, therefore, they cannot claim to be aggrieved by such order subsequently.

12. He pointed out that the interim order dated 15.10.2021 passed in HCA No.186 of 2021 was conditional upon furnishing of title documents of the property before the Nazir of the Court and argues that since such condition was not complied with, the order did not become operational.

13. He further submitted that vide final Order dated 08.11.2022 the said HCA was disposed of with direction to all parties to appear before the learned Single Judge and file appropriate applications in Execution No.51/2019, if not filed so far, seeking recall/modification of the Impugned Order dated 12.10.2021 and in the meanwhile, interim order dated 15.10.2021 was to remain operative subject to further orders, as may be passed by the learned executing Court. Therefore, he argued that it is wrong

to suggest that vide such final Order dated 08.11.2022 learned Division Bench disposing of the HCA No.186/2021 continued the operation of the interim order dated 15.10.2021 *ad-infinitum*. According to the learned counsel the DB decided that it could be modified by the Executing Court on applications. The learned counsel was asked whether the banks were parties to the said HCA and he submitted that the Applicant/HBL & HMBL had filed applications to become party in HCA No.186/2021, which however has been disposed of with all pending applications along with the final order.

14. He submitted that in any event an application under Order XXI, Rules 58 and 60 read with Section 151 CPC bearing CMA No.409/2021 (page 149) had already been filed on 20.10.2021 by the NBP as is evident from the supportive affidavit of such CMA available on the record, which were dismissed vide order dated 06.09.2023. Several other banks also filed applications as per directions of the DB, however the Applicants/HBL & HMBL did not file any application as per option given in Order dated 08.11.2022. He referred to Order dated 24.02.2025 followed with reasons dated 27.02.2025 in which objections of three banks in Execution No.51/2019 were dismissed. He, therefore, argued that the continued operation of the interim order dated 15.10.2021 was only till such time that objections were filed and since not only those were filed but they have also been dismissed there is no suspension of the Order dated 12-10-2021 in effect anymore. He highlighted the reasons for such dismissal and submitted that all the arguments raised by the present Applicants have already been discussed and rejected vide such orders. He argued that since the Executing Court has not modified the Order dated 12-10-2021, the Impugned Order dated 17-04-2026 does not suffer from any infirmity and the present petitions are an abuse of the process of the Court. He submitted that out of all the banks, only National Bank of Pakistan filed an appeal bearing HCA No.419/2023 to challenge Order dated 6.9.2023, which is still pending.

15. He further submitted that learned Single Bench in Execution No.51/2019 passed Order dated 27.10.2025 (page 185) concluding that the Order dated 12-10-2021 was never suspended on appeal and directions given therein were never modified till date as all the applications presented by various banks have been dismissed on 06.09.2023 and 24.02.2025, reasons for which have been given on 24.02.2024. He highlighted that operative part of Order dated 08.11.2022 was reproduced which shows that the learned Single Bench was very much aware of the directions contained therein. He submitted that Respondent No.2 filed HCA No.116/2025 to challenge the Orders dated 27.10.2025 but the said appeal was withdrawn and dismissed vide Order dated 10.11.2025 therefore he argued that right

or wrong the said order is still in the field, which cannot be reviewed by way of the instant Civil Revision Application.

16. The learned counsel for Respondent No. 1 further submitted that the civil revision filed is under Section 115 CPC, in which the grounds mentioned in sub-section (1)(a) & (b) have not been invoked. With regard to ground in 115(1)(c), he submitted that the Petitioners have not pressed into service any illegal exercise of jurisdiction, and the only ground mentioned would, at best, fall within 'material irregularity'. He submitted that the arguments he has submitted regarding the various orders passed, in light of which the impugned order has been passed, shows that there was no material irregularity in passing of the impugned order that would justify exercise of powers under Section 115 CPC. He also pointed out that under Section 115(1), the High Court may call for the record of any case *"which has been decided by any Court subordinate to such High Court"*, and argued that the impugned order does not decide the case before the Executing Court. He emphasized that Section 115 CPC is a discretionary jurisdiction, and for exercise of discretionary jurisdiction, the conduct of the parties is very relevant for the Court to appreciate, and that in the instant case, the conduct of the parties does not merit exercise of discretionary jurisdiction in their favour. He highlighted that the Supreme Court in *Khan Bahadur Khan Vs. Khan Malook Khan,* PLD 2022 SC 482, relied upon by the learned counsel for the Applicant to justify filing of a revision beyond the limitation period, declined to subscribe to the theory that *suo motu* jurisdiction of the Court under Section 115, CPC can be exercised at any time despite delay in approaching the Court by explaining that such approach would leave a sword of Damocles hanging over the head of the other side.

17. In exercise of his right of rebuttal, the learned counsel for the Applicant-National Bank of Pakistan submitted a copy of the memo of appeal filed in HCA No. 186 of 2021 to highlight that, by way of its prayer, setting aside of the impugned order dated 12.10.2021 passed by the Single Judge in Execution No. 51 of 2019 was sought. He reiterated that the order dated 08.11.2022 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in HCA No. 186 of 2021 categorically held that the interim order dated 15.10.2021 would remain operative. When asked about the next part of the order, whereby it holds that the interim order shall be subject to further orders as may be passed by the learned Executing Court, he submitted that no order modifying such order has been passed. He argued that the impugned order has misinterpreted and completely overlooked the order dated 15.01.2021 as well as the order dated 08.11.2022, while concluding that the order dated 12.10.2021 was never suspended. He relied upon the cases of *M/s*

Khurshid Soap & Chemical Industries (Pvt.) Ltd. and others v. Federation of Pakistan and others, PLD 2020 SC 641, *Muhammad Saifullah v. Lahore Development Authorities and others*, PLD 2021 Lahore 168, *Manager, Jammu & Kashmir, State Property in Pakistan v. Khuda Yar and another*, PLD 1975 SC 678, *Askari Bank Ltd. v. M/s Khawaja Flat Glass Industries (Pvt.) Ltd. and others*, 2025 CLD 1176, *Board of Governors, Area Study Centre for Africa and North America, Quaide-e-Azam, University, Islamabad and another*, PLD 2005 SC 153 and *Bibi Sundus and others v. Bibi Shahida and others*, 2020 CLC 1475.

18. The learned counsel for the Applicant/HBL adopted the arguments made by the learned counsel for the Applicant-NBP, but submitted that his case is different as he is a Decree-Holder.

19. Service on Respondent No. 2 was made on 19.08.2026 for 20.08.2026, despite which none appeared on their behalf on that date. Thereafter, notice was issued on 16.09.2026 for 18.09.2026, which according to bailiff report was served on 17.09.2026 yet none appeared on 18.09.2026 or the date after that. Today, after the learned counsels for the Respondent No. 1, the Applicants/NBP & HMBL as well as for Applicant/HBL were heard and the matter was reserved, Mr. Abdul Ahad Nadeem, Advocate stepped forward to submit an undertaking to file Vakalatnama on behalf of Respondent No. 2 on the next date. The undertaking to file Vakalatnama on behalf of the Respondent No. 2 does not amount to appearance of the party in view of Order 3, Rule 4, CPC whereby no pleader shall act for any person in any Court unless he has been appointed for the purpose by such person by a document in writing signed by such person. As such, since none has appeared on behalf of Respondent No. 2 despite service, the matter is being decided *ex-parte* against Respondent No. 2.

20. Heard the learned counsels for the Applicants and Respondent No.1 and perused the entire record with their assistance.

21. The concluding paragraph contained in Order dated 12-10-2021 whereby the Execution No. 51 of 2019 was allowed while dismissing the objections filed by the Respondent No. 2 is reproduced herein below:

> *"20. To conclude, the foreign decree is conclusive between the parties within the meaning of section 13 CPC and is executable under section 44-A CPC. Consequently,* ***the objections of the JD are dismissed and the Execution is allowed.***
>
> *The assets of the JD that are sought to be attached and sold are mentioned in the Execution Application read with CMA Nos. 300/2019 and 301/2019. Under cover of statements dated 28-04-2021 and 05-05-2021 the JD has also filed a list of its assets. Therefore,* ***subject to any charge or***

***encumbrance** existing on those assets, and as a first step towards execution, the following assets of the JD are hereby attached until further orders as follows:*

(i) The JD is prohibited from transferring the shares held by it in the following companies together with any bonus and right shares:

(a) Hascombe Lubricants (Pvt.) Ltd.,
having its office at Suite No. 105-106, The Forum, Khayaban-e-Jami, Block 9, Clifton, Karachi;

(b) VAS LNG (Pvt.) Ltd.
having its office at Suite No. 102, 1st Floor, The Forum, Khayaban-e-Jami, Block 9, Clifton, Karachi;

(c) Hascol Terminals Ltd.
having its office at Plot No.s D-15 to D-18, G5 and G6, North Western Industrial Zone, Port Qasim Authority, Bin Qasim, Karachi.

(ii) The JD is prohibited from withdrawing or transferring the credit balances of its bank accounts maintained with the banks listed in CMA No. 300/2019, the details of which are in Appendix 'A' to this order (filed by the JD), and said banks are restrained accordingly.

(iii) The JD is prohibited from transferring or charging in any way the immovable properties listed in Appendix 'B' to this order.

***The above order of attachment of movables** shall be transmitted by the office to the companies and banks mentioned in sub-paras (i) and (ii) above as per Order XXI Rule 46(2) CPC, and said companies and banks shall report compliance to the Nazir of this Court. Along with the relevant compliance of Order XXI Rule 54(2) CPC, the attachment order of the immovable properties in sub-para (iii) above shall be communicated to the relevant record keepers and Registrar of properties. CMA No. 143/2021 stands disposed of as above."* [Emphasis added].

Contrary to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Applicants/NBP & HMBL, the above-reproduction of paragraph 20 of the said Order reveals that the bank accounts of the Respondent No. 2 maintained with the banks listed in CMA 300/2019 filed in Execution No. 51 of 2019, the details of which are in Appendix 'A' to the Order dated 12-10-2019 *are* included in the list of assets that were attached. Admittedly, the present Applicant banks were listed in the said CMA. It is also relevant to note that such attachment was subject to any charge or encumbrance existing on such assets. Therefore, there is ample protection for secured creditors in such order. Since the Applicant/HBL claims to be a secured creditor Decree-Holder, its rights are already acknowledged and protected in the order dated 12.08.2021, whereby attachment was ordered subject to charges and encumbrances.

22. In any event, the Respondent No. 2 filed HCA 186 of 2021 against such Order *inter alia* on the grounds that the order dated 12.10.2021 is beyond the scope of the foreign judgment; there is ample coverage of the decretal amount through attachment of the immovable assets / properties and shareholding; that attachment of the Respondent No. 2's bank accounts is unnecessary and will have the effect of halting the operation of

Respondent No. 2 including payment of salaries to its 1500 employees. The interim order dated 15-10-2021 records that the learned counsel for the Respondent No. 1 while appearing in response to notice under Order XLIII, Rule 3, CPC, vehemently opposed the suspension of the order dated 12-10-2021 as according to the learned counsel, the Respondent No. 2 had not deposited the security whereas there was already prior charge over the assets of the Respondent No. 2. He sought directions to the Respondent No. 2 to secure the decretal amount by submitting title documents of immovable property of the Respondent No. 2 i.e. Plot Nos. B-26 and B-27, measuring 8.7 acres, situated at North Western Industrial Zone, Port Qasim Authority, Bin Qasim, Karachi, which is free from any charge/encumbrance whereas 50% of the remaining decretal amount shall be deposited in the shape of bank guarantee before the Nazir of the Court. While issuing notice to the Respondent No. 1, the Court directed the Respondent No. 2 to furnish the title documents of the aforesaid property with the Nazir of the Court as security and *"subject to furnishing such documents, operation of the impugned order [dated 12.10.2021], to the extent of attachment of bank accounts of the appellant [Respondent No. 2], shall remain suspended*. *However, such bank accounts shall only be utilized for the purpose of carrying on the day- to-day business affairs of the company, including payment of salaries to employees and to meet statutory legal obligations, till further orders in the instant appeal."*

23. There can be no manner of doubt that the suspension of the order dated 12-10-2021 albeit to the extent of attachment of bank accounts of the Respondent No. 2 vide the said interim Order dated 15-10-2021 was not unconditional. It was subject to the furnishing of title documents of the aforesaid property with the Nazir of the Court. While the learned counsel for the Respondent No. 1 argued that it was never complied with, copy of the Order dated 15-10-2021 contains a certificate from the Additional Registrar (Civil) that in compliance of the said order, the Respondent No. 2 deposited the original documents in respect of Plot Nos. B-26 and B-27, measuring 8.7 acres, situated at North Western Industrial Zone, Port Qasim Authority, Bin Qasim, Karachi through statement /list dated 16-10-2021, which are kept with the nazarat in safe custody vide Serial No. 7136 till further order of the Court. In view thereof, it appears that the suspension of the Order dated 12-10-2021 to the extent of attachment of bank accounts as ordered vide Order dated 15-10-2021 came into effect on 16-10-2021.

24. Vide the final disposal Order dated 08-11-2022, the parties were directed to file, within seven days of the order, appropriate applications in Execution No. 51/2019, if not already filed, for recall/modification of the

order dated 12-10-2021 while the learned Single Bench was directed to pass appropriate orders on such applications preferably within four weeks from the date of hearing of such applications and in the meanwhile the interim order dated 15-10-2021 was to remain operative subject to further orders, as may be passed, by the learned Executing Court. When read holistically, it becomes clear and apparent that the intention behind the Order dated 8-11-2022 was to allow the interim order 15-10-20121 to remain effective till such time that the applications allowed to be filed by the parties before the Executing Court seeking recall/modification of the order dated 12-10-2021 are decided and subject to the order passed in respect of such applications. Thus, it was left to the Executing Court to ultimately decide whether or not the order dated 12-10-2021 was liable to be recalled/modified but till such decision it was suspended to the extent of attachment of bank accounts.

25. The Applicants/NBP & HMBL along with another bank that is not before this Court had already filed CMA 409 of 2021 praying for release of the bank accounts of the Respondent No. 2 as set out in Appendix 'A' of the Order dated 12-10-2021 from attachment and to permit the Respondent No. 2 to withdraw and transfer credit balances therein for the purpose of its business and permit the banks to allow the Respondent No. 2 to do so. The Applicants/NBP & HMBL highlighted the same concerns as raised before this Court as to the adverse effect of suspension of the Respondent No. 2's bank accounts upon the secured creditors. While deciding the said application along with other applications filed by various other banks, the Executing Court considered the Order dated 8-11-2022 yet dismissed all such applications including CMA 409 of 2021 filed by the Applicants/NBP & HMBL and another by taking into account and considering each and every argument raised on behalf of the Applicants/NBP & HMBL in the present applications including the purported adverse effect upon the banks/secured creditors of the Respondent No. 2. It has been observed that it is inconceivable as to how and under what law the assets of a judgment debtor could be exposed to dissipation in the subsistence of a decree and an order passed in execution securing the same. The order further notes that secured creditors are in any event protected as paragraph 20 of the order dated 12-10-2021 clearly states that the attachment is subject to the charge and encumbrance existing on the assets. Similarly, the objections of certain other banks were dismissed by order dated 27.02.2025.

26. Thus, upon passing of the Orders dated 06-09-2023 and 27-02-2025 by the learned Executing Court whereby the applications made by the banks seeking release of the bank accounts of the Respondent No. 2 from

attachment were dismissed, the interim order dated 15-10-2021 allowing suspension of attachment for limited purpose and which was continued by way of order dated 8-11-2022 ceased to hold the field in terms of the latter order whereby the interim arrangement was to continue till such time the Executing Court decided whether to recall/modify the order dated 12-10-2021 on application of the parties. Although the Order dated 6-09-2023 is under challenge in appeal but admittedly no order has been passed for its suspension which therefore continues to hold the filed.

27. This was also the conclusion reached by the Executing Court in Order dated 27-10-2025 while transferring the matter to the District Court. The said order was challenged by the Respondent No. 2 in HCA 116 of 2025 which however was withdrawn as per order dated 10-11-2025, and hence has attained finality.

28. In such circumstances, the argument raised on behalf of the Applicants that the interim order dated 15-10-2021 continues in operation is a blatant misstatement of fact. The conclusion reached by the Executing Court vide the Impugned Order is beyond reproach. The Impugned Order does not suffer from any defect or infirmity or irregularity warranting interference by this Court that too by *suo moto* exercise of revisional jurisdiction given that the instant applications are time barred and the present applications challenging the same on the same grounds which have been rejected previously by various orders is an abuse of the process of Court especially considering the misstatement of facts as highlighted above. Resultantly, the instant revision applications are dismissed as time barred and being devoid of merit with cost of Rs. 100,000/- on each of the Applicants to be deposited with the Nazir of the Court within 15 days of the instant order, which will be paid to the Respondent No. 1 with compliance report to be submitted for perusal in chamber.

[SAMAN RAFAT IMTIAZ]
JUDGE

Imran