

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

C. P. No. D-4915 of 2021

Date Order with signature of Judge

Present: *Mr. Justice Muhammad Junaid Ghaffar*
Mr. Justice Agha Faisal

Petitioner: Abdul Jabbar,
Through Mr. Nusrat Ali Shar,
Advocate.

Respondent No. 1: Federation of Pakistan
Through Mr. S. Yasir Ahmed Shah,
Assistant Attorney General.

Respondent Nos. 2 & 3: SSGC Limited & another,
Through Mr. Mukesh Kumar G.
Karara, Advocate along with Mr. Nabi
Bux Leghari, Advocate.

- 1) For order on CMA No. 21209/22.
- 2) For hearing of CMA No. 20168/21.
- 3) For hearing of main case.

Date of hearing: 19.10.2022.
Date of Order: 19.10.2022.

ORDER

Muhammad Junaid Ghaffar, J: Through this Petition, the Petitioner seeks regularization of his service with Respondent No.2 i.e. Sui Southern Gas Company Limited (SSGCL). However, the issue regarding maintainability of such petitions have already been decided by this bench vide order dated 11.08.2022 in CP No.1173 of 2022 (***Barkat Ali Khan Jatoi v Federation of Pakistan & Others***) by relying upon the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case reported as (***Sui Southern Gas Company Limited v Saeed Ahmed Khoso and another 2022 SCMR 1256***). The relevant finding is as under;

"2. We have heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioners and Respondents on the point of maintainability. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case as above, as relied upon by the Respondent's Counsel has been pleased to hold as under:-

5. We have heard the learned Counsel for the parties and gone through the record. The only question requiring determination by this Court is whether or not the High Court correctly exercised the jurisdiction under Article 199 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973. It is settled law by this court that where employment rules are non-statutory in nature, the relationship of employer and employee is governed by the principle of master and servant. The learned ASC for the Respondent does not contest, neither that the rules governing terms and conditions of employment of the Respondent are non-statutory nor that ordinarily the principle of master and servant would apply in governing the relationship between the employer and the employee.

However, he has attempted to draw a distinction between the Companies owned by the Federal Government and the companies registered under the Companies Ordinance, 1984 / Act, 2017 which have private shareholders to argue that where the State has a stake in the company then it has to be treated on a different footing and its rules are to be treated as statutory in nature. In this context, he has relied upon the judgments of this court reported as Muhammad Rafi v. Federation of Pakistan (2016 SCMR 2146) and Pakistan Defence Offices Housing Authority v. Itrat Sajjad Awan (2017 SCMR 2010).

6. Having gone through the aforementioned judgments, we find that the said judgments relate to the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan, the Civil Aviation Authority and the Defence Housing Authority. There is a clear distinction in the treatment of statutory Bodies and the Corporations as opposed to the limited companies. Consequently, we are not impressed by the argument of learned counsel for the Respondent that a Company in which the Government has a shareholding is to be treated at par with statutory Corporations and Authorities.

8. Further, the learned High Court has unfortunately not noticed three judgments of this Court noted in paragraph 5 above which directly relate to the questions in hand and has instead relied on general principles of law relating to statutory corporations and authorities which were clearly not attracted to the facts and circumstances of the case. The argument of the learned counsel that the Respondent was entitled to due process where his civil rights were to be determined may could have substance. However, in the instant case, only question before us is which forum was available to him in the facts and circumstances of the case before which the rights claimed by the Respondent be asserted. The instant case, we are in no manner of doubt that such forum was not the High Court in exercise of its constitutional jurisdiction under Article 199 of the Constitution.”

Apparently, the Petitioner’s case is fully covered by the aforesaid Judgment and therefore, no exception can be drawn regarding maintainability of this Petition. In view of hereinabove facts and circumstances of this case, the Petition is not maintainable; hence, the same is hereby dismissed. However, the Petitioner is at liberty to avail any other remedy as may be available in accordance with law.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Ayaz