

ORDER SHEET
THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI

C.P. No. D – 2505 of 2025
[Muhammad Shafqat v. Province of Sindh & others]

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE(S)
	Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon Mr. Justice Zulfiqar Ali Sangi.

Date of hearing and order:-11-02-2026

Mr. Muhammad Rizwan, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. Abdul Jalil Zubedi, AAG Sindh alongwith Mr. Akhlaq Ahmed Kalwar, Deputy Director (Recruitment), SPSP, Hyderabad, is present in Court.

O R D E R

Adnan-ul-Kari Memo, J Petitioner, Muhammad Shafqat, has filed this Constitutional Petition under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, seeking the following relief(s):

- I. Set aside the impugned Order dated 20.2.2025, being unlawful, illegal, and passed without any justification.*
- II. Restrained the Respondents or their agent from appointing or awarding the position of Lecturer Islamiat (BPS-17) under disable quota to any third person.*
- III. Declare that the conduct of the Respondents and the press release dated 24.12.2024, against the Petitioner, is discriminatory in nature and is liable to be overturned.*
- IV. Declare that the impugned order passed by the Respondent is without any reasonable justification and as such liable to be decided afresh after providing a reasonable opportunity of hearing to the Petitioner and shall be passed with the detailed reasons whatsoever;*
- V. Call upon the complete record of the assessment awarding 15 marks and recordings (video and audio) of the interview to verify the justice with the Petitioner while conducting the interview.*
- VI. Grant any other relief that this Hon'ble Court may deem just, fair, and appropriate in the circumstances of the case. ”*

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner contended that although the Petitioner secured high marks in the written examination, he was declared unsuccessful in the interview. His appeal under the Sindh Public Service Commission

(Recruitment Management) Regulations, 2023 was dismissed, and a subsequent appeal under Regulation 161 was also rejected through a speaking order dated 18-08-2025.

3. The Commission observed that despite topping the written test, the Petitioner secured only 15 out of 100 marks in the interview and failed to meet the qualifying criteria. It was held that interview assessment falls within the prerogative of the Interview Committee and may only be interfered with upon proof of mala fide or gross irregularity, which the Petitioner failed to establish.

4. At this stage, learned counsel argued that the impugned order is not a proper speaking order and is liable to challenge before the competent forum.

5. Without expressing any opinion on its legality, we leave the matter to be agitated before the appropriate forum, if so advised.

6. The petition is disposed of accordingly, along with pending application(s).

JUDGE

JUDGE

*SHABAN**