

HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, MIRPURKHAS

Before:

Justice Arbab Ali Hakro

Justice Muhammad Jaffer Raza

C.P No.D-303 of 2026

[Amanullah v. Province of Sindh and 05 others]

Petitioner by : Mr. Mir Muhammad Nohri, Advocate

Respondents by : Mr. Ghulamullah Memon, Additional A.G
Sindh a/w Dr. Lekhraj, D.H.O, Tharparkar @
Mithi.

Dates of Hearing : **05.05.2026**

Date of Decision : **19.05.2026**

ORDER

ARBAB ALI HAKRO J:- The petitioner has invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution, alleging that despite being a permanent resident of Village Charnor Gajo and despite the District Recruitment Committee having finalized its proceedings on 07.08.2023, the respondents have failed to issue him an appointment order against a non-technical post sanctioned for Government Dispensary Charnor Gajo. It is asserted that the petitioner's name stood included in the list prepared by the DRC and that the respondents are now attempting to induct candidates from other villages in disregard of the recruitment policy, the neighbourhood-residency criteria and the earlier directions of this Court in C.P. No. D- 973 of 2025.

2. The factual matrix emerging from the pleadings reflects that the petitioner predicates his claim upon the DRC proceedings dated 07.08.2023, asserting that his candidature was duly recommended. The petitioner further relies upon the SOPs issued by the SGA&CD on 26.01.2023, particularly the 70% weightage reserved for immediate neighbourhood residence and contends that the respondents have acted in derogation of the said policy by

favouring non-locals. It is also urged that similarly placed candidates have already obtained relief from this Court in earlier petitions.

3. The respondents, however, have taken a categorical stance that the petitioner neither applied nor appeared before the District Recruitment Committee and that his name does not appear in the official list issued under outward No. DHO/TPR/12315 of 2023. It is further asserted that the petitioner's claim of recommendation is misconceived, that the DRC list relied upon by him is not borne out from the official record and that all offer letters issued by the department were strictly in compliance with the directions of this Court in C.P. No. D-973 of 2025.

4. Heard and perused the record.

5. The record placed before us reveals a serious divergence between the version of the petitioner and that of the official respondents. The petitioner asserts that his name was duly recommended by the DRC, whereas the respondents insist that the petitioner never applied and that the list relied upon by him is not part of the official record. The respondents further allege that the outward numbers mentioned in the documents relied upon by the petitioner do not correspond with the official dispatch register. These allegations, if correct, would amount to manipulation of public record; conversely, if the respondents' stance is incorrect, it would amount to suppression of material facts and administrative impropriety.

6. The disputed factual substratum, the allegation of fabrication of recommendation lists, the contest regarding outward registers and the conflicting claims as to whether the petitioner was ever recommended by the DRC, are matters which cannot be adjudicated conclusively in the exercise of constitutional jurisdiction without a proper forensic and administrative inquiry. The controversy is not confined to an individual grievance but appears to be part of a wider pattern of allegations surfacing in multiple petitions concerning the same recruitment cycle. In these circumstances and in order to safeguard

the integrity of the recruitment process, to ascertain the authenticity of the documents relied upon by both sides and to determine whether any manipulation, fabrication or administrative impropriety has occurred, it is imperative that the matter be examined by a neutral and competent authority.

7. Accordingly, in view of the disputed factual matrix and the serious allegations raised by both sides, this petition is **disposed of** with directions to the Chief Secretary, Government of Sindh, shall constitute a high-level inquiry committee headed by a senior officer not below BPS- 20 of the Services, General Administration & Coordination Department, to examine the entire recruitment process for non-technical posts (BPS-01 to BPS-04) pertaining to Government Dispensary Charnor Gajo and other similarly situated facilities in District Tharparkar. The committee shall scrutinize the DRC minutes dated 07.08.2023, the recommendation lists, the outward registers, the dispatch records and all connected documents and shall determine whether the petitioner was duly recommended, whether any manipulation or fabrication occurred and whether any officer or candidate acted in violation of law. The inquiry shall be concluded within sixty days and appropriate action shall thereafter be taken strictly in accordance with law. The petitioner shall be at liberty to place his entire material before the inquiry committee.

With these directions, the petition stands **disposed of**.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Faisal