

**THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT
LARKANA**

Present:

Mr. Justice Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry
Mr. Justice Ali Haider 'Ada'

Constitution Petition No. D-20 of 2026

[Aamir Ali Khoso Versus Province of Sindh & another]

Mr. Ghulam Dastagir A. Shahani, Advocate holds brief on behalf of Mr. Ahsan Ahmad Qureshi, Advocate for Petitioner.

JUDGMENT

Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry J. - This is the second petition by the Petitioner for a writ to the District & Sessions Judge Larkana for appointing the Petitioner as staff on the son quota pursuant to instructions/circulars issued by the High Court under the Sindh Judicial Staff Service Rules, 1992. His first petition for the same writ, C.P. No. D-218/2024, was dismissed by this Court along with a bunch of other petitions vide order dated 28.10.2024 on the ground that no such writ can issue after pronouncement of the Supreme Court in *General Post Office, Islamabad v. Muhammad Jalal* (PLD 2024 SC 1276) [*Jalal's case*], whereby it was held that rules and polices for making appointments on the deceased or son quota (saving certain exceptions), were unconstitutional. No appeal or review was preferred by the Petitioner against the dismissal of his first petition. Given these circumstances, we decline the request for adjournment.

2. This second petition has been brought on the ground that after dismissal of the first petition, the Supreme Court passed judgment dated 01.09.2025 in other matters (C.A. No. 106-K to 111-K & 650-K of 2024 etc., *Province of Sindh v. Azhar Ali & others*) to uphold certain orders passed by the High Court of Sindh for appointment on the deceased quota after observing that *Jalal's case* does not operate retrospectively. However, it will be seen that orders of the High Court upheld by the Supreme Court by judgment dated 01.09.2025, were orders passed prior to *Jalal's case*, and for this reason it was held there

that *Jalal's case* does not operate retrospectively to effect matters already adjudicated. Admittedly, the Petitioner's first petition (C.P. No. D-218/2024) was dismissed after *Jalal's case*. Therefore, judgment of the Supreme Court dated 01.09.2025 has no bearing on the Petitioner's case and does not constitute a fresh cause of action for a second petition. It has already been held by this Court in *Sanaullah v. Deputy Commissioner, Larkana* (Referee opinion dated 24.11.2025 in C.P. No.D-99 /2025) that *Jalal's case* did not save applications and petitions pending for appointment on the deceased/son quota.

3. In view of the foregoing, this petition is dismissed in *limine*

JUDGE

JUDGE

Larkana:

Dated: 27-01-2026