

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR
C. P No. D – 1648 of 2025

Hearing of case (Priority)

1. For orders on office objection at flag 'A'
2. For hearing of CMA No.6476/2025 (S/A)
3. For hearing of main case

02.12.2025

Mr. Abdul Raheem Mahar, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. Rehmat Ali Shaikh, Advocate for Respondent No.8
Syed Naveed Ahmed Shah, Deputy Attorney General
Deputy Attorney General along with Ashique Ali, Head Cler
(Litigation) Branch Pakistan Railways, Divisional Superintendent,
Sukkur

ORDER

Through the instant Constitutional Petition, the petitioner seeks directions against Respondent No.4, impugning Notice No.941-E/7/Pt-III/CSF dated 03.09.2025, whereby the residential Quarter No. 289-F&G, Block Q-26, CSF Colony, Adam Shah Road, Sukkur, earlier allotted to the petitioner, has been cancelled.

Conversely, Respondents No.3, 4 and 5 (Pakistan Railways Department) have filed their comments, wherein it is asserted that although the petitioner was duly allotted the subject quarter, an inquiry was initiated on the complaint of Respondent No.8. It is stated that the Inquiry Committee called the petitioner on 04.06.2025, and during the proceedings it transpired that the petitioner was involved in subletting / renting out the premises. Consequently, on the recommendations contained in the Inquiry Report, the petitioner's allotment was cancelled.

Respondent No.8, through private counsel, has also filed a reply, stating that the petitioner had sold the railway quarter to the father of Respondent No.8 for a total consideration of Rs.600,000/- on 10.12.2020. It is further stated that Respondent No.8's family expended significant amounts on making the premises livable and had been residing therein for approximately five years. According to Respondent No.8, the petitioner subsequently began harassing her family and demanded an additional sum of Rs.300,000/-, which she refused to pay, whereupon the petitioner allegedly extended threats of eviction.

We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for Respondent No.8 as well as the learned DAG, and have examined the

available record. Admittedly, the petitioner, being an employee of Pakistan Railways, was allotted Quarter No.289-F&G, Block Q-26, CSF Colony, Adam Shah Road, Sukkur; however, he sublet the same to the father of Respondent No.8. On a complaint lodged by Respondent No.8, an inquiry was initiated, and based on the findings and recommendations of the Inquiry Committee, Respondent No.4 lawfully cancelled the petitioner's allotment.

In these circumstances, the petitioner has failed to approach this Court with clean hands. Accordingly, this petition, being misconceived, is dismissed along with the listed application.

Judge

Judge