THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

C. P. No. D – 711 of 2026

Sadaqat Ali Rid
versus
Sindh Public Service Commission, Hyderabad & others

Present:
Mr. Justice Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry
Mr. Justice Muhammad Hasan (Akber)

Petitioner	:	Sadaqat Ali Rid, in person
For Respondents	:	Mr. Ali Raza Baloch, Additional Advocate General Sindh
Date of hearing	:	28.10.2026
Date of decision	:	10.11.2026

JUDGMENT

Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry J.– Pursuant to an advertisement dated 24.10.2025 made by the Sindh Public Service Commission **[SPSC]** inviting applications for vacancies, the petitioner applied for the post of Senior Law Officer (BPS-18). On provisional basis, he was allowed to sit for the pre-interview written test where he obtained passing marks, 43 out of 100. However, upon processing his documents, the SPSC issued to the Petitioner a rejection letter dated 06.04.2026 on the ground that he was not eligible for the post as he did not possess 7 years' experience at the Bar after obtaining LL.M. degree. Against such rejection, the petitioner made a representation before the single Member of the SPSC under Regulation 161 of the Sindh Public Service Commission (Recruitment Management) Regulations, 2023 **[RMR 2023]**. That representation was dismissed by order dated 16.04.2026 **[impugned order]**. Though Regulation 161 further provides an appeal to the Appellate Committee of the SPSC, such remedy was not availed by the petitioner before invoking the writ jurisdiction.

2. The qualification for the post of Senior Law Officer (BPS-18) as advertised by the SPSC was as follows:

> *i. A Degree in L.L.M/Bar at Law at least in 2nd Division from a University recognized by Higher Education Commission (HEC).*
> *ii. Having at least seven (07) years' experience of standing at the Bar and not less than seven years' as an advocate of High Court.*

3. It is not in dispute that the petitioner fulfilled the first qualification i.e. he possessed an LL.M. degree in 2nd Division. As per the rejection

letter issued by the SPSC, the petitioner did not fulfill the second qualification i.e. he did not possess 7 years' experience at the Bar, which period is to be counted from his LL.M. degree. Admittedly, if the 7 years' period is counted from the LL.M. degree, the petitioner does not possess such experience. The case set-up by him in his representation to the SPSC was that the 7 years' period had to be counted overall and thus he fulfilled the second qualification as well. The SPSC rejected that contention by citing Regulation 130 of the RMR 2023 which reads:

> ***"130. Experience prescribed mandatory for minimum qualification.*** *In cases where experience has been prescribed as mandatory prerequisite for the post, the period of experience gained only after acquiring the minimum qualification shall be counted. Any experience gained during the period of acquisition of the minimum qualification shall not be counted."*

4. As per Regulation 130, the period of experience relevant is the one gained after acquiring the minimum qualification prescribed for the post. In this this case, the minimum qualification was an LL.M. degree. Therefore, Regulation 130 is a complete answer to the petitioner's argument. Even the advertisement had categorically stated that: "*The experience shall be reckoned from the date of acquiring minimum academic qualification required for the post.*" Therefore, the impugned order correctly noted that the petitioner did not qualify for the post.

5. Confronted with Regulation 130 of the RMR 2023, the petitioner seeks to address his deficiency by raising a constitutional challenge to the Regulation itself, which is then also cited as reason for not availing the remedy of appeal provided by Regulation 161.

6. The petitioner submitted that Regulation 130 discriminates between different posts, in that, it is not applied by the SPSC to all posts. However, the Regulation itself stipulates that it is applicable "*In cases where experience has been prescribed as mandatory prerequisite for the post*". Thus, the Regulation makes a reasonable classification for posts that require experience. In doing so, it does not offend Article 25 of the Constitution of Pakistan, 1973.

7. In view of the foregoing, the challenge to the constitutionality of Regulation 130 of the RMR 2023 is misconceived. The petition is dismissed.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Abdul Basit