

ORDER SHEET  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH,  
CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

**Before:**

**MR. JUSTICE MUHAMMAD HASAN (AKBER)**

**MR. JUSTICE MUHAMMAD OSMAN ALI HADI**

C.P. No.D-826, 830, 907, 908, 914, 915, 963, 994, 997, 1034,  
1035, 1068, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1083, 1116 and 1120 of 2026

Date of hearing: 22.06.2026.

Petitioner Zulfiqar Ali Shah in person.

We are passing a common order in the above titled petitions, since they relate to same Petitioner, and were taken up in a collective cluster. The Petitioner has filed the instant petitions allegedly under the guise of public interest and/or alleged violations of human rights.

**2.** It is submitted at the outset that the Petitioner, namely Zulfiqar Ali Shah, had recently previously also invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court by filing thirteen (13) similar themed constitutional petitions<sup>1</sup>, which were all dismissed by this Court.

**3.** A simple perusal of the any of the above titled constitutional petitions before us today would clearly demonstrate that the Petitioner has failed to provide any cogent grounds or *bona fide* reasoning for invocation of the Constitutional Jurisdiction of this Court. All the above-titled

---

<sup>1</sup> (i) C.P. No.D-645 of 2026; (ii) C.P. No.D-646 of 2026; (iii) C.P. No.D-647 of 2026; (iv) C.P. No.D-648 of 2026; (v) C.P. No.D-650 of 2026; (vi) C.P. No.D-702 of 2026; (vii) C.P. No.D-776 of 2026; (viii) C.P. No.D-777 of 2026; (ix) C.P. No.D-778 of 2026; (x) C.P. No.D-779 of 2026; (xi) C.P. No.D-780 of 2026; (xii) C.P. No.D-781 of 2026; and (xiii) C.P. No.D-782 of 2026.

petitions, bar none, are meritless and without any legal justification. Moreover, the subject matter of some of the petitions are identical to the subject matter of the previous petitions filed by the petitioner, which were already dismissed by this Court in the earlier part of this year (mentioned *supra*).

**4.** It appears clear that the Petitioner has filed the instant constitutional petitions without any proper legal contentions; and has wasted significant public time and resources by filing such a vast amount of petitions, without any regard for the costs incurred for processing matters through the court structure. This has also resulted in genuine litigants being deprived of their rights to a hearing of their cases, since these frivolous petitions have clogged part of the Court docket.

**5.** It surfaces that the Petitioner is a habitual litigant, who seems to have a strong tendency of filing meritless petitions before this Court. The Petitioner's frivolousness and carelessness in the instant matters was also reflected by his contempt-worthy attitude when in Court, by initially not proceeding with the matters, until he was informed no further adjournment would be granted, followed by remaining unable to answer any single question relating to the merits or maintainability of any of the instant petitions. He was further unable to furnish any response as to why in some instances multiple petitions were filed on the same subject matter; and he also had not disclosed the previous petitions on some of the same subject matters which were dismissed by this Court.

**6.** Even a simple perusal of any of the memo(s) of petition show the submissions to be vague and baseless. Unfortunately it has become commonplace to file petitions before this Court without giving any thought of the merits, the burden for which remains on the public exchequer funding the process, as well as at the cost of genuine litigants whose cases are unable to be heard due to overburden of the court system. This practice has repeatedly been deprecated, and a three

member bench of the Supreme Court in the case of *Javed Hameed v Aman Ullah & Ors*<sup>2</sup> *inter alia* held:

*“4. Courts must be vigilant that the process of the court is not abused, and ensure that legitimate owners are not deprived of their properties. From the date of filing of the suit till date 14 years have elapsed, and petitioners who were not entitled to the said land continue in possession of it, probably thinking there would no consequences for their actions. This impression must be corrected. Courts must impose costs whenever it is required, stem frivolous litigation and stop the abuse of the process of the court in perpetuating wrongdoing.”*

**7.** Similar sentiments have been echoed by the Supreme Court even in more recent judgements, such as in the *Federal Public Services Commission*<sup>3</sup> case whereby it was observed:

*“3. .... This Court has recently affirmed that, while the right of access to courts is a cornerstone of our constitutional framework, it is not an unqualified or limitless right. Such access must be exercised with responsibility and in a manner that upholds the dignity and finality of judicial proceedings. When litigants, such as the petitioner institution before us, initiate repetitive and meritless petitions, they erode the integrity of the judicial process. Frivolous litigation not only clogs judicial dockets but also drains public resources and delays justice for genuine litigants.”*

**8.** We are not only bound by the dictum stated by the Supreme Court (*ibid.*) but are also in complete agreement with such sentiments. In light of the foregoing, these petitions being meritless are hereby dismissed, and the Petitioner is directed to pay cost of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) **per petition** towards before the Library of the Sindh Bar Association - Hyderabad, positively within three (3) days from

---

<sup>2</sup> 2024 SCMR 89

<sup>3</sup> PLD 2025 SC 713

the date of this Judgement, and submit such receipt before the Additional Registrar of this Court. In case of failure to deposit the costs as imposed, the same shall be recovered from the Petitioner as land revenue.

9. These petitions stand **dismissed** in the above terms.
10. These are the reasons for our short order dated **22.06.2026**.

JUDGE

JUDGE

\*Abdullah Channa/PS\*