

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT**  
**LARKANO**

***Constitutional Petition No. S-486 of 2025.***  
***Mehmood-ur-Rehman vs P.O.Sindh and others)***

---

Date	Orders with signature of Judge
------	--------------------------------

---

1. *For order on office objection.*
2. *For hearing of main case.*

**03-06-2026**

Mr. Muhammad Afzal Jagirani, Advocate for the petitioner

.....

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not press the instant petition as the dispute between the petitioner and the private respondents has subsequently been settled amicably.

At the very outset, it may be observed that the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court cannot be invoked merely as a means to exert pressure upon private parties and thereafter abandoned based on a subsequent settlement. Such practice is discouraged, as the constitutional jurisdiction vested in this Court is meant for enforcement of legal and fundamental rights and not for facilitating private compromises after invocation of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court.

Perusal of the material available on record reflects that the petitioner approached this Court seeking a writ directing the official respondents not to harass him at the instance of the private respondents and further sought protection. However, it is a settled principle of law that where an

adequate and efficacious alternate remedy is available under the law, constitutional jurisdiction under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973 is ordinarily not invoked except in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances.

The issue involved in the instant petition is squarely covered by the dictum laid down by the Honourable Division Bench of this Court in *Abdul Hameed and another v. Province of Sindh and others* (PLD 2019 Sindh 168), and is further in line with the judgment passed by this Court in C.P. No. S-482 of 2025 (*Manzoor Ali v. Province of Sindh and others*), wherein it has been held that constitutional petitions seeking protection and restraint against alleged harassment are not maintainable where an alternate remedy is available under the law.

In the present case, the petitioner had an alternate remedy available under the law, yet directly invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court. Therefore, even otherwise, the petition was not maintainable.

Accordingly, in view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner that he does not press the petition, and for the reasons discussed above, the instant petition is dismissed as not pressed and, otherwise, being not maintainable in law.

**JUDGE**