

ORDER SHEET

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR**

**C. P. No. D – 1997 of 2014**

Date of hearing	Order with signature of Judge
-----------------	-------------------------------

**For directions**

1. For hearing of CMA No.6506/2023 (Contempt/App)
2. For hearing of CMA No.2254/2022 (Contempt/App)

**07.11.2023**

Mr. Abdul Sattar N. Soomro, Advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. Ubedullah Malano, Advocate for respondents-SEPCO along with Habibullah, Line Superintendent, Sub-Division Pir-Jo-Goth.  
Mr. Muhammad Aslam Jatoi, Assistant Attorney General.

.---.---.---.---.---

Mr. Nauman Fareed Shaikh, Advocate has filed power on behalf of respondents-SEPCO, which is taken on record.

This petition filed against officials of Sukkur Electric Power Company (**'SEPCO'**), essentially seeking uninterrupted supply of electricity to the petitioner, was disposed of on 22.07.2014, when SEPCO officials filed comments disclosing load management schedule for July 2014 in respect of SEPCO Sukkur, and the petitioner's Counsel did not press the petition subject to directions to the respondents to act strictly in accordance with law.

Thereafter, record reflects that petitioner has been filing so many applications, such as CMA No.4226/2015, alleging contempt of the Court's order on the part of SEPCO officials without, however, disclosing the exact act constituting contempt of the Court. Of late, petitioner has filed CMA No.6506/2023 seeking proceedings against the alleged contemnors U/S 3 & 4 of Contempt of Courts Act. In the entire application, the petitioner has not clarified as to contempt of which Court's order has been allegedly committed by the alleged contemnors except that since May 2023, the alleged contemnors have stopped supply of electricity to petitioner and other general public. This hardly constitutes contempt of the aforesaid order, by which the petition was disposed of as not pressed on petitioner's Counsel's own statement. But, in any case, a copy of the schedule has been filed by the Counsel for alleged contemnors for the relevant area covering

petitioner's house as well, which comes within 11 KV feeder, and has further submitted that the load shedding is being carried out for 20 hours, and for 04 hours, the electricity is being supplied, which is due to "0" percentage recovery of electricity charges from petitioner and other people living in the area.

The schedule and statement made by the Counsel for the SEPCO officials is a sufficient reply to the application filed by the petitioner, which, as we have noted, is not even otherwise maintainable on account of non-disclosure of exact act of the SEPCO officials constituting the contempt of this Court's order, which does not even otherwise speculate any mandatory directions to the SEPCO officials. Therefore, the same is **dismissed**.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Abdul Basit