

ORDER SHEET
THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR
C. P. No. D – 1863 of 2019

Date of hearing	Order with signature of Judge
-----------------	-------------------------------

Hearing of case

1. For orders on office objection at Flag-A
2. For hearing of main case

18.08.2026

Mr. Sunder Khan Chachar, Advocate for petitioner.
Mr. Israr Ahmed Shah, Assistant Advocate General Sindh along with Inspector Naveed Akbar Pirzada on behalf of DIGP Sukkur and SSP Ghotki.

.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-

Through the instant petition, the petitioner seeks directions from the respondents for his appointment as Constable, contending that he had qualified in the MCQ test and interview and was declared medically fit.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has drawn this Court’s attention to the minutes of the meetings held on 12.01.2018 and 22.02.2018 under the Chairmanship of the Additional IGP Sindh, at which the cases of candidates/petitioners seeking appointment through general recruitment as well as reinstatement in service were considered. The petitioner’s name appears at serial No.21, where it was recorded that he had applied for the post of Constable in General Recruitment 2016-17 in District Ghotki, but was shown as absent in the final interview result due to a clerical mistake, as intimated by the DIGP Sukkur Range. Accordingly, the Board recommended the issuance of an appointment order in his favour for the post of Constable, subject to character verification and completion of other codal formalities.

On being confronted with the above position, learned AAG Sindh submits that, as per the para-wise comments furnished by DIGP Sukkur Range (respondent No.4), after receipt of the aforesaid minutes, SSP Ghotki, vide letter dated 07.05.2018, reported that the petitioner had been absent from the interview/viva voce held on 19/20.09.2016 and, therefore, could not be issued an appointment order. The office of DIGP Sukkur Range, agreeing with the said position, requested IGP Sindh, Karachi, for cancellation of the approval earlier granted in favour of the petitioner.

In view of the foregoing, the controversy before us turns on disputed questions of fact, particularly whether the petitioner appeared for the final interview/viva voce held on 19/20.09.2016. Such disputed factual controversy cannot appropriately be adjudicated in constitutional jurisdiction.

Consequently, finding no merit in the instant petition, the same is hereby **dismissed**.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Abdul Basit