HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, MIRPURKHAS

C.P No.D-254 of 2026

[Muhammad Aqib & others *v.* Province of Sindh and others]

Before:

Justice Zulfiqar Ali Sangi
Justice Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro

Petitioners by	:	Mr. Aziz Ahmed Laghari advocate.
Respondents by	:	Mr. Muhammad Sharif Solangi, Assistant A.G Sindh.
Date of Hearing	:	17.11.2026
Date of Order	:	17.11.2026

O R D E R

Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro J:- Through the instant petition, the petitioners claim appointments to the posts of Primary School Teachers in compliance to the orders dated 07.10.2024 and 03.12.2025 passed in C.P No.D-1303/2024 and order dated 09.09.2024 passed in C.P No.D-1052/2024 by the learned Divisional Benches of this Court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners applied for the posts of Primary School Teachers under the Teachers Recruitment Policy, 2021. They belong to Taluka Khipro, the hard area criteria were applicable to them and they were entitled to appointments. He prayed for allowing of this petition in terms of the orders passed in petitions referred in Para-I, hereinabove.

3. Controverting the submissions, learned A.A.G submitted that appointments under the Teachers Recruitment Policy, 2021 have been finalized and the minimum passing marks on merit under the said policy were 40%; however, the petitioners obtained 38 marks. Therefore, they were declined for appointments. He prayed to dismiss the petition.

4. Heard arguments and perused the material available on record. The record reveals that under the Teachers Recruitment Policy, 2021, the passing marks in the recruitment test were fixed at 40%, whereas the petitioners obtained 38 or less marks and, as such were not eligible for appointments on merit. The petitioners' claim for the benefit of the hard area criteria or any order passed by this Court in favour of other candidates is not tenable, as the merit criteria fixed by the department cannot be changed by this Court. Appointment is purely an administrative issue and falls within the domain of the department. Moreover, the process has already been finalized; therefore, no case for indulgence is made out. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed along with listed application (s).

JUDGE

JUDGE

Chander Kumar