

# HIGH COURT OF SINDH CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

## C.P No.S-563 of 2026

[Adeel Mangrio vs. Mst. Iqra Adeel and others]

|                      |                                                            |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Petitioner:          | By Mr. Iftikhar Hussain Mangrio<br>advocate a/w petitioner |
| Respondent No.1:     | By Mr. Imtiaz Ali Channa, Advocate,<br>a/w respondent No.1 |
| Official respondents | By Mr. Allah Bachayo Soomro,<br>Additional A.G S Sindh     |
| Date of hearing      | 26.10.2026                                                 |
| Date of Decision     | 26.10.2026                                                 |

## ORDER

\*\*\*

**ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON J:-** This petition under Article 199 of the Constitution impugning an order under Section 17-A of the West Pakistan Family Courts Act, 1964 is disposed of pursuant to an amicable compromise between the parties vide statement dated 26.10.2026 signed by both the parties.

2. The respondent Mst. Iqra wife of the petitioner filed Family Suit for maintenance, recovery of dower, dowry articles, and gold ornaments, alleging that she was married to the petitioner in December 2015 and that three children were born from the wedlock. The respondent alleged that the petitioner owns 110 acres of agricultural land, a warehouse (Godown) worth Rs. 7 Crore, and a flat worth Rs. 4.2 Crore, earning a monthly income of over Rs. 350,000/-. The petitioner categorically denies these exaggerated allegations. During pendency of the suit, the trial court allowed the respondent's application under Section 17-A and fixed interim maintenance at Rs.8,000/- per month for each minor without recording evidence or determining the actual financial capacity of the petitioner.

3. Initially, it was contended that the trial court determined the financial status and income of the petitioner without recording any oral or documentary evidence, relying solely on the bold, unsubstantiated, and exaggerated assertions of the respondent. The respondent claimed the petitioner owns massive agricultural lands, a warehouse, and a flat, but failed to produce any title deeds, revenue records, bank statements, or tax returns to substantiate these claims. The impugned order is a non-speaking order as the trial court failed to assign cogent reasons, did not assess the actual educational, medical, and dietary needs of the minors, and arbitrarily fixed Rs. 8,000/- per child. The trial court failed to consider that the respondent herself is gainfully employed and earns a monthly salary of Rs. 20,000/-, which is relevant to the overall financial circumstances. By fixing a heavy

interim maintenance amount based on unproven allegations, the trial court virtually prejudged the core disputes of the main suit before trial.

4. During the course of hearing, the parties demonstrated a mutual inclination toward an amicable resolution of their marital grievances. Consequently, the parties, along with their respective legal representatives, executed and filed a joint written statement of compromise, confirming an out-of-court settlement. Under the agreed terms, Respondent No.1 (wife) has voluntarily agreed to forgive past differences, end the separation, and rejoin the petitioner in the matrimonial home to restore full conjugal relations. In turn, both parties have solemnly undertaken to fulfill their matrimonial obligations with mutual respect and dignity toward each other and their respective families. The petitioner has explicitly bound himself to refrain from any mistreatment, abuse, or violence towards the respondent, while simultaneously undertaking the duty to provide adequate shelter, lawful maintenance, and proper educational and medical care for his wife and minor children strictly in accord with his financial means.

5. In light of the aforesaid compromise arrived at freely and voluntarily between the parties, the fundamental dispute forming the basis of the original suit and the interim maintenance order stands fully resolved. Courts always favor and encourage the preservation and reunion of family ties, particularly in light of the best interests and welfare of minor children.

6. Accordingly, the joint compromise statement filed by the parties is accepted and taken on record. The impugned order dated 09.09.2026 passed by the Family Judge-IV, Hyderabad in Family Suit No. 713 of 2026 is hereby modified/disposed of in terms of the compromise statement. The trial court to draw decree accordingly.

7. This petition stands disposed of accordingly, leaving the parties bound strictly by the terms and undertakings recorded herein.

JUDGE

Karar\_Hussain/PS\*