

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,
HYDERABAD.

C.P.No.S- 478 of 2021

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

1. For orders on office objection.
2. For hearing of main case.

28.02.2022.

Mr. Muhammad Hassan Chang, Advocate for petitioners.
Mr. Muhammad Ismaill Bhutto, Additional A.G alongwith SIP Muhammad Yaseen
SHO PS Badin.

=

Petitioners Mst. Rukhsana and Manzoor Ahmed have filed this Constitutional Petition under Article 199 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973 against the respondents and prayed for the following relief(s):-

“a) That this Honorable Court may be pleased to direct respondent No.2 to 5 provide and ensure protection of life, honor, prestige and property to the petitioners and family members of petitioner No.2 against the sheer highhandedness of the relatives of petitioner No.1.

b) That this Honorable Court may be pleased to direct the respondent No.3 & 4 to restrain / bound the respondents / relatives of petitioner No.1 from causing undue harassment to the petitioners and family members of petitioner No.2.

c) That this Honorable Court may be pleased to direct the respondent No.3 & 4 not to register any FIR against the petitioner No.2 and his family members.

d) That this Honorable Court may be pleased to direct the respondents / relatives of petitioner No.1 to furnish their statements before this Honorable Court that they will not harass to petitioners and family members of the petitioner No.2 in any form or manifestation.

e) That this Honorable Court may be pleased to direct the respondent No.2 to 5 restrain the respondent No.6 to 11 not to cause any sort of harassment to the petitioners or the family members of the petitioner No.2 on the instructions of the private respondents, further he may be directed to act in accordance with law.

f) That this Honorable Court may be pleased to grant any other relief which the Honorable Court deems fit and proper in view of the above facts to be granted in favor of the petitioner.”

Notices were issued against the respondents as well as A.A.G. Respondents No.2 and 5 were directed to provide protection to the petitioners if and when they approach the police concerned. Parawise comments are filed by respondents No.2 to 5 in which allegations against the police have been denied and it is stated by SSP Hyderabad that petitioners have never approached the SSP office and protection as required in law will be provided to the petitioners if and when needed. A.A.G also undertakes that the police officials are bound to provide protection to every citizen including the petitioners in accordance with law.

In the view of above, counsel for the petitioners does not press the instant petition more, it is accordingly disposed of.

JUDGE

Tufail

