HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

C.P. No.D-316 of 2018
[Karo vs. Province of Sindh, others]

Before:
JUSTICE ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON
JUSTICE MUHAMMAD JAFFER RAZA

Petitioner:	Through Mr. Bilawal Bajeer, Advocate
Official respondents:	Through Mr. Rafique Ahmed Dahri, Additional A.G Sindh
Private respondents:	None present
Date of hearing	30.10.2026
Date of Decision	30.10.2026

O R D E R

***

ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON J The petitioner claims to be in the lawful possession of a residential village land allotted to him and other villagers under the Sindh Gothabad Scheme, duly reflected in Form-II of the Record of Rights.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the property has been inherited from his forefathers and that private respondents 7 to 10, in collusion with revenue officials and under the influence of local political figures, are attempting to illegally occupy the village, interfere with his peaceful possession, and prevent access to it. He adds that despite approaching local influential persons and official respondents, no action has allegedly been taken to protect his rights and the private respondents are threatening him and his family with dire consequences and that there is an apprehension of dispossession and harm to their lives. Hence, the instant petition seeks police protection, prevention of harassment, and restraint against any unlawful alteration of the revenue record or interference with his possession.

3. Respondents 5 & 6 deny the allegations of harassment and maintain that no complaint or criminal case is pending against the petitioner at Police Station Matli; the dispute between the petitioner and private respondents 7 to 10 relates to ownership/ possession of land and is essentially civil and revenue in nature, falling within the jurisdiction of Revenue Authorities. They further state that the petitioner never approached the police station for protection or reported any cognizable offence; however, necessary protection shall be provided to him in accordance with law whenever approached. They deny any wrongdoing.

4. In view of the nature of the controversy, the rival claims raised by the petitioner and private respondents involve disputed questions of fact regarding the ownership, status and possession of the subject land, which cannot be conclusively determined in these proceedings without proper examination of the relevant revenue record and factual position at the site.

5. Accordingly, Deputy Commissioner, Badin, is directed to conduct site inspection, ascertain the actual status and nature of the land, examine the relevant revenue record, including the entries in the Record of Rights, and afford an opportunity of hearing to all concerned parties. In case the land is found to be Government property, appropriate action shall be taken strictly in accordance with law after examining the rights and claims of the parties concerned. The Deputy Commissioner shall thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order and submit a compliance report before this Court through the Additional Registrar of this Court within 30 days.

6. The petitioner and private respondents shall extend full cooperation during the proceedings. Needless to observe that, in case any party is aggrieved by the decision of the Deputy Commissioner, it shall be at liberty to avail the remedy available under the law, if its cause so survives. Meanwhile, the official respondents shall ensure that no party takes the law into its own hands or disturbs the existing position except in accordance with law.

7. With the above directions, the instant petition stands disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Karar_Hussain/PS*