

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA
C.P No. S-34 of 2026
[Naveed Ahmed Versus Province of Sindh & Others]

Date	Order with signature of Judge
1.	For orders on M.A No.87/2026.
2.	For orders on office objection.
3.	For orders on M.A No.88/2026.
4.	For orders on M.A No.89/2026.
5.	For hearing of Main Case.

26.01.2026

Mr. Abdul Rehman A. Bhutto, Advocate for the Petitioner.

-x-x-x-x-x-

Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry, J:- Urgency granted. The petitioner has challenged ejectment order dated 31.10.2024 passed by the Rent Controller, Jacobabad in Rent Case No.01 of 2023 filed by the respondent No.4, which ejectment order was upheld by the Additional District Judge-II, Jacobabad in Rent Appeal No.06 of 2024 vide order dated 24.12.2025. The demised premises was a shop measuring 22-2 Sq. Yards, said to be bearing City Survey No.1087/1 and claimed by respondent No.4 / landlord as his property. The defence of the petitioner / opponent was that said shop was not the property of respondent No.4, rather, it was the property of Municipal Committee, Jacobabad, to whom the petitioner was paying rent. While respondent No.4 produced an extract of the property register to show that the City Survey No.1087/1 was his property, the petitioner did not produce any document in support of his defense. Infact, the Chief Municipal Officer Jacobabad submitted a report denying that the suit shop had been allotted by the Municipality to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon a report dated 23.10.2024 submitted by the Mukhtiarkar, Jacobabad to the Rent Controller, which suggests that the shop claimed by respondent No.4 in City Survey No.1087/1 was different, which had been demolished in an anti-encroachment operation in the year 2021, whereas, the subject shop in possession of the petitioner was situated next to City Survey No.1087/1

within Municipal land. Though it is not shown that the Mukhtiarkar's report was ever exhibited in evidence before the Rent Controller, such report does not support the petitioner's case, rather it suggests that subject shop had also been constructed by encroaching public land.

Be that as it may, assuming that respondent No.4 had constructed subject shop by encroaching public land, that is a dispute between him and the local government. The petitioner cannot avoid ejectment proceedings on the basis of such dispute. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the ejectment order passed by the Courts below.

The petition is dismissed in *limine*.

JUDGE

Zulfiqar