

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT LARKANA**

**Constt: Petition No.S-152 of 2026**  
(Rajesh Kumar & another Vs. P.O Sindh & Ors)

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

01. For orders on office objection "A".
02. For hearing of main case.

**03.06.2026.**

Mr. Noor Ahmed Lashari, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*=.\*=.\*=.\*=.\*=.\*=.\*=.\*=\*

Through the instant petition, the petitioners seek protection on the ground that they are allegedly facing threats at the hands of the private respondents.

Conversely, a perusal of the record reflects that the petitioners had already approached the learned Justice of Peace by filing Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.439 of 2026 seeking protection, which was allowed vide order dated 10.03.2026. Thus, the relief of protection had already been granted by the competent forum.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners further contended that certain luggage and other movable property of the petitioners had allegedly been stolen by the private respondents. When confronted as to whether any legal remedy had subsequently been availed before the competent forum with regard to the alleged theft or commission of a cognizable offence, learned counsel failed to satisfactorily answer the query and merely reiterated that the luggage had been stolen.

It is a settled principle of law that where an adequate and efficacious alternate remedy is available under the law, the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution ordinarily cannot be invoked. In this regard, reliance may be placed upon the judgment of the learned Division Bench of this Court in *Abdul Hameed and another v. Province of Sindh and others* (PLD 2019 Sindh 168), wherein it has been held that harassment petitions are not maintainable where the aggrieved person has an alternate statutory remedy available.

Since the petitioners have already obtained a protection order from the competent forum and, with regard to the alleged theft, have failed to avail the remedies provided under the law, no case for invoking the extraordinary constitutional jurisdiction of this Court is made out.

Accordingly, the instant petition, being misconceived and not maintainable, is dismissed.

**JUDGE**