

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

Constitutional Petition No.D-479 of 2025.

**[Dr. Azhar Ali Shah vs. M/s Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir
Bhutto Medical University and others]**

Date

Order with the signature of the Judges

Before:-

**Mr. Justice Amjad Ali Bohio,
Mr. Justice Ali Haider 'Ada'.**

28.04.2026.

Mr. Ghulam Shabir Shar, Advocate for Petitioner.
M/s Qurban Ali Malano, Syed Naimat Ali Shah,
Advocates for respondents No.8 and 9.
Mr. Ali Raza Balouch, Additional Advocate General.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance upon judgment dated 15.04.2026 passed in C.P. No. D-587 of 2025, whereby the impugned notification dated 28.03.2025 was suspended by this Court. It has been contended that the present petition arises out of the same cause and involves identical parties, particularly respondent Nos. 5 and 6, and that the grievance of the petitioner also pertains to non-consideration of his case by the Selection Board of the University.

Learned Additional Advocate General, appearing on behalf of the respondents, fairly conceded that the instant petition is similar in nature to C.P. No. D-587 of 2025, and that the notification dated 28.03.2025, issued by the Registrar of the University, already stands suspended by this Court.

In view of the above and upon perusal of the record, it appears that the petitioner is also aggrieved by the same impugned notification dated 28.03.2025, which has already been suspended. Accordingly, the respondent-University is directed to convene a meeting of the Selection Board within a

period of fifteen (15) days for reconsideration of the petitioner's case through a comprehensive assessment, including interview, seniority, suitability, and all other relevant criteria, as may be applicable. The Selection Board shall pass a speaking and well-reasoned decision, even if recorded through a specific agenda item and resolution, ensuring that the reasons are clearly reflected. The entire exercise shall be completed within a period of one (01) month from the date of convening of the meeting. It is further clarified that the suspension of the notification shall continue only to the extent of respondent Nos. 5 and 6 (as mentioned at serial Nos. 3 and 4 therein) and shall not affect the rights of other candidates reflected in the said notification. Upon completion of the aforesaid exercise, the respondent-University shall issue a fresh notification strictly in accordance with the recommendations so made. It is also clarified that remanding the matter to the Selection Board is not intended to fill any lacuna or gap in the earlier process, but rather to ensure transparency, fairness, and proper justification in the decision-making process concerning the petitioner as well as other competing candidates, including respondent Nos. 5 and 6. With these observations, the instant constitutional petition, along with the listed applications, stands disposed of.

J U D G E

J U D G E