

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI

Present:

Mr. Justice Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry

C.P. No. S - 631 of 2026

[Mst. Hina Hijab and others versus Shehzad Ahmed and another]

Petitioners : Mst. Hina Hijab and two minor children through Mr. Muhammad Javed, Advocate.

Date of hearing : 06-07-2026

Date of decision : 06-07-2026

ORDER

Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry J. - 1] Urgency granted. 3] Exemption granted subject to all just exceptions. 2&4] The Petitioner, as Plaintiff of Family Suit No. 24/2025, seeking a decree for maintenance for herself and minor children, moved an application in the suit with multiple prayers *inter alia* for summoning the travel history of the Respondent No.1 [Husband], his bank statements and for enhancement of the interim maintenance awarded by the Family Judge. The Respondent No.1 did not object to submitting his travel history. The learned Family Judge allowed the application only to the extent of summoning the travel history and bank statements of the Respondent No.1 for last two years, however, denied other prayers made in the application *inter alia* observing that the prayer for enhancing interim maintenance was premature when evidence had yet to be recorded. The Petitioner assailed that order before the learned District & Sessions Judge, Malir, Karachi, in Family Appeal No. 01/2026. The learned Appellate Court modified the order of the Family Judge by summoning travel history of the Respondent No.1 upto five years instead of two years, whereas, declined the appeal against refusal to enhance interim maintenance. Against that, the Petitioner seeks a *writ of certiorari* from this Court.

2. As discussed above, notwithstanding that the Petitioner had sought multiple reliefs by way of single miscellaneous application, both Courts below allowed the main relief i.e. for summoning documents of travel history and bank statements of the Respondent No.1. The Petitioner is aggrieved only to the extent that her prayer for enhancing interim maintenance was declined. After having gone through the impugned orders, I am of the view that both the Courts below have rightly held that enhancing the amount of interim maintenance at the stage when evidence is being recorded, would be premature. Therefore, learned counsel is not able to satisfy the Court to interfere with the impugned orders in *writ* jurisdiction. Petition is therefore dismissed in *limine*.

JUDGE

SHABAN*