

**ORDER SHEET**  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA

**Constitution Petition No. D-212 of 2026**

[Prof. Dr. Muhammad Hanif Shaikh Versus Province of Sindh & others]

**Present:**

Mr. Justice Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry  
Mr. Justice Abdul Hamid Bhurgri

For Fresh Case

1. For orders on M.A No.860/2026.
2. For orders on office objection.
3. For orders on M.A No.861/2026.
4. For orders on M.A No.862/2026.
5. For hearing of Main Case.

**Petitioner** : Prof. Dr. Muhammad Hanif Shaikh son of Allah Bux Shaikh, through Mr. Waqar Ahmed Chandio, Advocate.

**Date of Hearing** : 10-03-2026

**Date of Order** : 10-03-2026

**ORDER**

**Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry J.** - Urgency granted. The petitioner, serving as Dean, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences at the Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto Medical University, Larkana [**University**], has challenged certain departmental action taken against him.

2. On 04.10.2025, a female lecturer at the University (respondent No.6) subordinate to the petitioner, made a complaint of sexual harassment against him, which was referred to the Anti-Harassment Inquiry Committee constituted by the University for such purpose as mandated by The Protection against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act, 2010. Finding the complaint to be serious, the Inquiry Committee issued a charge-sheet to the petitioner on 24.02.2026. Given the charge-sheet, the Universities and Board Department acting on the instructions of the Chief Minister, the appointing authority at the University, issued notification dated 25.02.2026 placing the petitioner under suspension from the office of Dean, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences till such time the inquiry is completed. Resultantly, the Registrar of the University issued office order dated 25.02.2026 placing the petitioner under such suspension. By a written statement to the Inquiry Committee, the petitioner has denied the allegations in the complaint, terming them a retaliation against action taken by him as Dean against absentee lecturers. At the same time, the

petitioner has also expressed no-confidence in the Inquiry Committee and has made an application to its Chairman *viz.* the Vice Chancellor, that the Inquiry Committee be substituted.

3. The writ that the petitioner seeks from this Court is essentially to stop the Inquiry Committee from proceeding against him, and to set-aside the notification dated 25.02.2026 whereby the petitioner is suspended as Dean, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences of the University pending inquiry.

4. The inquiry being undertaken against the petitioner is under the provisions by The Protection against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act, 2010 [Act] by an Inquiry Committee of the University constituted pursuant to said Act. Learned counsel is not able to demonstrate that such inquiry is contrary to any provision of said Act. The allegation that the Inquiry Committee is biased against the petitioner is also unsubstantiated. In fact, the entire case of the petitioner seems to be that the complaint of harassment by respondent No.6 against him is *mala fide*. However, such question of fact can best be determined by the Inquiry Committee seized of the complaint. Under the scheme of the Act, if the Inquiry Committee recommends a penalty upon the petitioner, he will have a remedy before the Ombudsman.

5. For the foregoing reasons, there is no cause to invoke writ jurisdiction to interfere with the inquiry being undertaken by the University against the Petitioner. The petition is therefore dismissed in *limine*.

**Judge**

**Judge**