ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Const. Petition No. D-5021 of 2020

Date	Order with signature of Judge

Before:-
Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar
Mr. Justice Ali Haider 'Ada'

For hearing of Main Case.

04.11.2026

Mr. Asif Ali Khawaja, Advocate holds brief for Mr. Yahya Iqbal, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Ms. Wajeeha Mahdi, Assistant Attorney General for Pakistan.

———

O R D E R

RIAZAT ALI SAHAR, J.— The instant Constitutional Petition pertains to the year 2020 and has remained pending for a considerable period without any substantial progress. A perusal of the case diary sheets reveals that the matter was last fixed before this Court on 02.03.2023. Since then, no efforts appear to have been made by the petitioner to have the matter fixed for hearing or to pursue the proceedings.

2. Through the instant petition, the petitioner has sought the following reliefs:

I. Declare that the acts and omissions of the respondents are illegal and ultra vires.
II. Declare that the quota allocated to Sindh (Rural) for the year 2008 was not in accordance with law.
III. Direct the respondents to transfer the petitioner to the District Management Group (DMG).
IV. Direct the respondents to rectify the quota announced for the year 2008 by allocating six (06) seats to the DMG instead of five (05), as allegedly wrongly calculated by the respondents.
V. Award costs of the petition.

3. A perusal of the record reveals that the controversy raised in the instant petition relates to the allocation of seats under the quota prescribed for Sindh (Rural) in respect of the Competitive Examination held in the year 2008. The petitioner has essentially challenged the allocation of five seats to the District Management Group (DMG), claiming that six seats ought to have been allocated, and has sought consequential relief in respect of his placement in the said group.

4. It is pertinent to observe that the examination in question pertains to the year 2008, and more than eighteen years have elapsed since then. During this considerable period, the recruitment process and consequential allocations relating to the said examination would have attained finality. Moreover, the petitioner has not pursued the instant proceedings for more than three years. In these circumstances, and in the absence of any material demonstrating that an effective and enforceable relief still survives for adjudication, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the instant petition pending indefinitely.

5. In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, particularly the considerable lapse of time and the absence of diligent prosecution, the controversy raised in the instant Petition has lost its practical significance and has become infructuous. Consequently, the instant Constitutional Petition is **dismissed** as having become infructuous, along with all pending application(s), if any, with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

M. Khan