

HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, MIRPURKHAS

Before:

Justice Arbab Ali Hakro

Justice Muhammad Hasan (Akber)

C.P No.D-219 of 2026

[Ram Jee v. Province of Sindh and others]

Petitioners : In person

Respondents by : Nemo

Dates of Hearing : **04.03.2026**

Date of Decision : **04.3.2026**

ORDER

ARBAB ALI HAKRO J:- The petitioner has invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution, alleging that certain private respondents, in collusion with police officials, committed acts of dacoity, arson, terrorism and harassment on 24.11.2025 and thereafter refused to register his complaint. He seeks directions for the constitution of a Joint Investigation Team, the recovery of alleged stolen property, and the registration of an FIR against the proposed accused persons.

2. The petitioner states that he and his family were peasants cultivating the lands of the private respondents. He alleges that on 24.11.2025, the private respondents, allegedly wearing police uniforms and armed with weapons, committed dacoity of livestock, jewellery, cash and household articles and set his house on fire. He further alleges that the SHO of P.S. Naukot refused to register his complaint and threatened him with confinement. He relies on a press clipping dated 26.11.2025 and asserts that the local police are colluding with the private respondents. The petitioner also challenges the order dated 01.12.2025, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Mirpurkhas, whereby his applications under sections 22-A & 22-B Cr.P.C. were dismissed with costs.

3. The petitioner, appearing in person, submits that the police have refused to register his complaint and have framed incorrect reports. He contends that the private respondents are influential and have threatened him with dire consequences. He prays that this Court direct the DIG Crime Branch, SSP Crime Branch, FIA, and ACE to constitute a Joint Investigation Team and recover his alleged stolen property.

4. We have heard the petitioner in person and perused the Record. The petition is materially founded on the same set of allegations that have already been adjudicated by the competent forum under sections 22-A & 22-B Cr.P.C. The learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Mirpurkhas, through a detailed speaking order dated 01.12.2025, dismissed the petitioner's applications after examining the police report and the earlier proceedings initiated by his brother. The order clearly records that the brother of the applicant had earlier filed an application levelling similar allegations, and the applicant and his brother are habitual of moving this type of application. This finding, based on factual assessment and police verification, has not been challenged before the appropriate forum. Instead, the petitioner has attempted to re-agitate the same allegations through a constitutional petition, which is impermissible.

5. The jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 cannot be exercised to supervise or override statutory mechanisms for registration of FIRs, investigation of cognizable offences or factual determinations made by the Justice of Peace. The Supreme Court has consistently held that the High Court cannot direct the constitution of Joint Investigation Teams, the recovery of alleged stolen property, or the registration of FIRs in its constitutional jurisdiction, particularly where the petitioner has already availed the statutory remedy.

6. The prayer for recovery of alleged stolen property is also misconceived. Recovery is a matter of investigation and trial, not

constitutional adjudication. The petitioner has not placed any material to demonstrate violation of any enforceable fundamental right after the dismissal of his earlier applications. His allegations remain unsubstantiated and repetitive, and the petition appears to be an attempt to circumvent the binding order dated 01.12.2025.

7. For the reasons recorded above, this petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly **dismissed** in *limine*, along with pending miscellaneous application (s).

JUDGE

JUDGE

Sajjad Ali Jessar